

VOLUME XIV

MAY, 1928

NUMBER 5

**BULLETIN**  
**OF**  
**THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION**  
**OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS**

**REVIEWS**  
**ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES**

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; G. R. COFFMAN;  
MARGARET L. FARRAND; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD  
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Notes and Announcements

Annual Meeting.....	302
To Members of the Association.....	302
Annual Meetings of Other Societies.....	302
Summer School for Engineering Teachers.....	302
Land Grant College Survey.....	303
Holiday Courses in Europe.....	303
University of Porto Rico.....	303
University of Guatemala.....	304
Spanish-American Literature in American Colleges.....	304
Summer Courses in Spanish and Portuguese.....	304
International Finance Institute.....	305
Student Leagues of Nations.....	305
Institute of International Education.....	306
Annual Congress on Medical Education.....	309
International Copyright.....	312
Membership List.....	312

### Reviews

Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences, <i>F. A. Ogg</i> .....	313
American Universities and Colleges, <i>D. A. Robertson</i> .....	318
The American and the German University, <i>C. F. Thwing</i> .....	321
How to Study in College.....	322
Received for Review.....	322

### Association of American Colleges

Students and the Administration, <i>Lucia R. Briggs</i> .....	323
Cooperation of Trust Companies with Colleges and Universities, <i>T. Arnett</i> .....	324
Cost of College Education, <i>F. W. Reeves</i> .....	326
Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, <i>W. W. Boyd</i> ...	328
Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, <i>O. E. Randall</i> .....	329
College Personnel Technique, <i>A. L. Jones</i> .....	338

### Educational Discussion

Better Adjustment between the High School and the College, <i>R. L. Kelly</i> .....	342
---	-----



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

301

Organization and Publicity, <i>A. H. Thorndike</i> .....	343
The Function of the University, <i>G. J. Laing</i> .....	348
Association of Governing Boards of State Universities....	354
Curricular Gaps, <i>W. C. Ruediger</i> .....	358
The Junior College in California, <i>R. L. Wilbur</i> .....	362
A New Type of College, <i>Marion Coats</i> .....	365
Three Plans for Presidents, <i>O. Johnson</i> .....	367
Professor vs. Psychiatrist, <i>D. Slesinger</i> .....	367
Cleveland College: An Experiment in Adult Education, <i>A. C. Ellis</i> .....	371
A Contact Officer for Prospective Freshmen.....	377
Humanics, <i>W. E. Nickerson</i> .....	379
Business as a Profession, <i>N. M. Butler</i> .....	381
Boston Meeting of the Department of Superintendence, <i>W. C. Ryan, Jr.</i> .....	383
The Relation of Secondary Schools to Colleges, <i>A. L.</i> <i>Lowell</i> .....	384
The German University and the American, <i>C. F. Thwing</i> .....	387
Student Athletes, <i>H. W. Chase</i> .....	389
What Price Honor, <i>G. H. Moore</i> .....	391
The Pathfinders in the Wilderness, <i>M. L. Spencer</i> .....	392
Vacation <i>cum Laude</i> .....	394

## Local and Chapter Notes

Chicago, Board of Social Service and Religion.....	396
Summer Courses for Administrative Officers.....	396
Harvard, University Film Foundation.....	396
Johns Hopkins, Selection of President.....	397
Louisville, Tenure Conditions.....	398
North Carolina, Salary Differential Fund.....	398
Princeton, Dean of the Chapel.....	399
Southern California, College of Engineering.....	400
Wisconsin, Experimental College.....	400
Yale, Ph.D.'s.....	401
West Chester Normal, Tenure Conditions.....	401

## Membership

Members Elected.....	403
Nominations for Membership.....	405

## NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**ANNUAL MEETING.**—The next annual meeting will be held in New York City in connection with the American Association for the Advancement of Science on Tuesday and Wednesday, January 1 and 2, 1929. The preliminary program will be published in the October *Bulletin*.

**TO MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.**—The Nominating Committee solicits your participation in selecting a representative group of men and women to be nominated to the Association at its meeting next December for election of a Vice-President and ten Councilors.

It is fairly obvious that the kind of persons to nominate are those who will give thought to the work of the Association, who will probably be able and willing to attend the next two or three annual meetings and who will be so distributed as to give roughly proportional representation to all branches of academic, scientific, and professional education, and to all sections of the country.

The Committee will appreciate your consideration of this matter, personally, in chapter meetings, or otherwise. Please submit to the Nominating Committee in the near future, and before October first at the latest, the names of those persons (giving full name, rank, and title, and the reasons for suggesting each of them) who will, in your judgment, promote the welfare and do honor to the Association. Address your letter to the Chairman of the Committee.

H. L. RIETZ, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

**ANNUAL MEETINGS OF OTHER SOCIETIES.**—American Economic Association, Chicago, December 26–29. American Historical Association, Indianapolis, December 28–31. Modern Language Association, Indianapolis, December 28–31.

**SUMMER SCHOOL FOR ENGINEERING TEACHERS.**—Following last year's successful experiment of summer schools in mechanics at Ithaca and Madison, the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education has arranged a course for teachers of physics and one for teachers of electrical engineering in 1928. The session on the teaching of physics will be held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, President S. W. Stratton of the Institute serving as director. That on the teaching of electrical engineering will be held at Pitts-

burgh under the joint auspices of the University of Pittsburgh and the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, with Dean F. L. Bishop of the University and Professor Charles F. Scott of Yale as co-directors. Each session will be of three weeks' duration, beginning about July 5. Further information may be obtained from Professor H. P. Hammond, 33 West 39th Street, New York City.

LAND GRANT COLLEGE SURVEY.—Plans for the survey by the U. S. Bureau of Education include coordinate activities by a large group of committees including those on Extension Work, Home Economics, Agricultural Education, Professional Education of Teachers, Agricultural Research and Experiment Station Work, Student Relations and Welfare, Arts and Sciences, Commerce and Business, Engineering, Finance and Business, Library Facilities and Service. Corresponding questionnaires will be issued at intervals during the remainder of the calendar year.

HOLIDAY COURSES IN EUROPE.—This is the title of a pamphlet compiled by the League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, published in England, France, and Germany. It is planned as an annual publication and contains information in regard to eighty courses of university rank in eleven European countries. Copies may be obtained from the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, at twenty-five cents.

UNIVERSITY OF PORTO RICO.—Porto Rico's university is celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary. There is nothing in the history of its colonial ventures of which the United States has more right to be proud. In Rio Piedras is a North American university in a Latin environment which, while it brings to the sugar island the best of Anglo-Saxon culture, teaches primarily in Spanish, and respects Spanish culture. Latin students who want to learn English flock there, and North American students who want an easy bridge to Spanish. The University of Porto Rico has become a laboratory of the finest type of Pan-Americanism, and one of its chemical products is a new kind of human inter-American understanding. Every state university in the United States, many of the old private universities and most of the great institutions of learning south of the Rio Grande are sending delegates to this anniversary celebration.

*The Nation*, vol. 126, no. 3272

UNIVERSITY OF GUATEMALA.—The University of Guatemala has recently been reopened. Since its foundation about 1675 it has consisted of several separate Faculties rather than a closely-knit organization but the present National University is organized as a unit. The administrative organization is formed by the Council composed of the Deans of the different schools, a representative of the Government, the Secretary, and the President of the University who is elected by the Board of Instruction. This Board, composed of the professors and members of the Governing Boards of the various schools, is also authorized to prepare statutes and curricula and to create new schools. The student body elects one representative to serve on the Governing Board of each school.

The University is considering a plan for the exchange of professors with foreign universities.

SPANISH-AMERICAN LITERATURE IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.—Growing interest in Latin-American literature is evident all over the United States, says a recent statement from the Pan-American Union. A large number of colleges have recently introduced courses in Latin-American literature into the curricula of their Spanish departments. Yale has just given the title of Professor of Spanish-American Literature to the head of its department of Spanish. In all the courses in that department, except those which treat exclusively of Spanish literature, the language is taught from the Spanish-American point of view. Textbooks, newspapers, and problems dealing with Spanish America are used as working material. The University of Texas and Stanford University have each a chair of Latin-American Literature.

SUMMER COURSES IN SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE.—The student of Spanish and Portuguese can find opportunity for summer work in both Europe and the Americas. The University of Madrid has a summer session for foreigners from July 9 to August 4. The University of Coimbra, Lisbon, offers elementary and advanced courses from July 20 to August 31. The University of Berlin, from June 18 to July 30, will give an intensive course, for teachers and advanced students, in the Portuguese language, literature, history, and geography of Portugal and Brazil. The National University of Mexico, from July 2 to August 15, will give courses for both foreigners and Mexican teachers. The University of Porto Rico will hold a summer session from July 9 to August 22.

**INTERNATIONAL FINANCE INSTITUTE.**—International finance and foreign investments will be the subjects of the fifth annual institute under the auspices of the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation at the University of Chicago, June 18. Various views on both the political and economic phases of the financial question will be presented by the lecturers who will include Professors Gustav Cassel of the University of Stockholm, Cerrade Gini of the University of Rome, and T. E. Gregory of the University of London, Dr. Robert R. Kuczynski of the Institute of Economics, Washington, D. C., and Mr. Henry Kittridge Norton of New York. Representatives of several of the departments of the federal government, prominent bankers, business leaders, and economists will also take part in the program. Round tables will be organized for fuller discussions and public lectures will be given daily.

The Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation for the study of international relations was established at the University of Chicago in 1923 by a trust fund for "the promotion of a better understanding on the part of American citizens of the other peoples of the world, thus establishing a basis for improved international relations and a more enlightened world order."

**STUDENT LEAGUES OF NATIONS.**—A new form of intercollegiate cooperation on intellectual matters, put into practice first at Syracuse, N. Y., last April by the New York state universities and colleges, has caught the interest of student bodies throughout the country and is being developed this year in nearly fifty institutions. It is the holding of Model Assemblies of the League of Nations, in which the students take the part of delegates from all nations represented in Geneva, organize themselves into a deliberative body precisely along the lines of that world forum and debate international issues.

Three major groups have arranged Model Assemblies of the League in April and May. At Amherst, on April 7, New England institutions were represented by one hundred and sixty-nine delegates, who discussed an agenda dealing with disarmament and tariffs. At Cornell, May 4 and 5, colleges in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey had strong delegations. The third Model Assembly for which plans have been matured is that sponsored by the Michigan State College at East Lansing, which has obtained the permission of the Governor and the Secretary of State to hold the sessions in the legislative chamber of the State House. Hon. George W. Wickersham, formerly



Attorney-General of the United States and now president of the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, will be the principal speaker at the Michigan Assembly.

Added interest is lent to these model assemblies of the League through the fact that the cosmopolitan nature of American colleges largely permits the selection of students who are natives of many distant lands to represent those countries in the deliberations of the model sessions.

*Boston Transcript*

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION.—*Bulletin* No. 4 discusses American Education in Backward Countries. The extract ranges from unification of activities in international education to the recent work of the Institute itself. A careful investigation is now being carried on in Europe by the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation as to the best form of national agency that should be established for cooperating in educational matters with foreign agencies. The director of the Institute will leave for Europe about April 1, to participate in a conference on the subject. The results of the investigation and the conference will determine to a great extent the policy which the Institute will adopt in cooperating with agencies in foreign countries. The Institute has recently been made the official representative in the United States of the Office National des Universités et Ecoles Françaises not only to administer the Franco-American Exchange Scholarships, which it has done for several years, but also to take the place of the official representative hitherto sent to this country to arrange for the filling of teaching positions in both institutions of higher education and in secondary schools. The Institute is desirous of improving its service in the circuiting of foreign professors and men of affairs among the colleges. In order that the work may be effective, it requests the cooperation of all those interested in having men from other countries who have made some outstanding contribution to learning lecture to their students. It will welcome suggestions from heads of departments and others of the names of distinguished scholars whom they know to be interesting lecturers and who speak English fluently. If the larger universities, which usually take the initiative in bringing scholars from other lands, will inform the Institute in advance of the men they have invited, the Institute will try to arrange with the visitors to spend a portion of their time while in this country in lecturing

at some other institutions. If Institutions will inform us of the men from other countries whom they are eager to hear, the Institute will endeavor to enlist the interest of a sufficient number of institutions to make their coming possible.

Another important phase of the work of the Exchange Professors Bureau is to arrange itineraries and give letters of introduction to visitors to the United States who wish to make a study of some phase of our education. Numerous letters were also given by the Institute to Americans leaving for other countries for research and study.

As an agency for bringing different countries together in points of intellectual contact, it is quite natural that one of the most important functions of the Institute has been developing and administering a series of international student exchanges between the United States and the countries of Europe. The understanding and appreciation of one's neighbors can be best realized through a comprehension of their culture, of their social life, and of their psychology. In no more effective way can this end be attained than through the interchange of students and teachers, thereby effecting the interpretation through the observing eyes of critical youth.

At the present time such exchanges are maintained between this country and five European countries: Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, and Switzerland, and negotiations are pending with Austria and with Spain. These exchange fellowship opportunities are all for graduate study.

The movement described by the term "Junior Year Abroad" when participated in by organized groups under well-defined supervision, has won the hearty approval of all the factors concerned in its operation, the French educational authorities, the American college faculties, and the students themselves. It has passed out of the experimental stage and has now apparently become a permanent factor in international education. The student participating in it becomes so steeped in the French culture and civilization as to become a unique product of American and French education.

The committee justifies the principle of the Junior Year Abroad upon the following grounds:

(a) The number of college graduates able to speak and write French with a reasonable degree of ease and fluency will be greatly increased;

(b) The number of college graduates qualified to teach French in our schools will be similarly augmented;



(c) The training of teachers of French in our colleges will be strengthened by study abroad while they are in charge of foreign study groups;

(d) Solid foundations will be laid for effective postgraduate study later in France by students who desire to prepare themselves for teaching, business, or government service;

(e) There will gradually come to be a considerable body of college trained men and women with a good knowledge of the ideas and customs of the people of France upon which business interests and the government can draw;

(f) The broadening of the individual's point of view resulting from a year of study abroad will prove an enduring asset not only to him but to his college and to the community at large;

(g) Through all these things there will ultimately come a significant advance in our sympathetic knowledge of another country that may well exert a real influence upon the attainment of mutual understanding and good-will; and

(h) Finally, this year abroad should be an undergraduate year. Only if it is possible to take it as one of the regular four years of the undergraduate course, without postponing the attainment of the baccalaureate, will there be a significant number of students availing themselves of it. The average college student plans to go into a profession or business upon graduation, and there are few who consider spending an extra year abroad.

These arguments are equally valid, of course, for other foreign countries, and in large measure apply to graduate study as well. The American student abroad, be he graduate or undergraduate, enjoys the opportunity to study a "civilization other than his own" in the making, and is enabled to interpret and compare his own nation and its institutions with another nation and its institutions. Rich opportunities in every field of study and research are afforded in foreign universities providing an invaluable supplement to our own educational resources.

During the Christmas holidays, the Institute called together at its rooms the fellowship holders from foreign countries who were studying in institutions in New York or within a comparatively short distance of New York. A frank expression of views was made by these foreign students as to the relative merits of the educational system of their own country and of the United States as far as their experience in the one institution where they were studying justified an opinion. Certain characteristics of American education were generally admitted. The more intimate relations existing between professor and student and the greater freedom of the student were

favorably commented upon. But the great amount of time devoted to extra-curricular activities as against studies and the mechanical methods of administration, such as the accumulation of credits to secure a degree, were condemned. All the students were enjoying their stay in our colleges and all felt that they were receiving great benefit from it. Not the least happy aspect of the conference was the friendly manner in which French and German, Czechs and Hungarians, in fact all of those present, fraternized. The afternoon conference concluded with a dinner at the Faculty Club of Columbia University.

Last year, the National Student Federation of America, founded at Princeton in 1924, took its place as a full voting member among the thirty-two national student organizations that make up the Confédération Internationale des Etudiants.

In order to enable its members to benefit more easily by the work of the Commission and to make some contribution to its development, the National Student Federation of America has established a foreign relations office in New York. This office is concerning itself with making arrangements for one hundred elected American students to visit Europe in small groups during the summer of 1928, and for groups of European and South African students to visit America in the fall. In addition this office will serve as headquarters for the issuance of the International Student Identity Card in the United States. As has already been mentioned the Federation will, beginning in 1928, undertake the scheduling and arrangement of international debates.

The *Guide Book for the Foreign Students in the United States*, first issued in 1920, has been in such demand that the second edition printed in 1923 became exhausted last spring. The Institute took advantage of the occasion to revise the edition slightly.

The report concludes with a tabulation showing antecedents of more than 7500 foreign students studying in American institutions from 1921 to 1927, the institutions at which they are registered, and their professional departments.

ANNUAL CONGRESS ON MEDICAL EDUCATION.—The annual congress on Medical Education was held in Chicago, February 6, 7, and 8. Sir Norman Walker, of Edinburgh, a guest of honor, described the system of medical education prevailing in Great Britain, the "block system," under which the student is not allowed to begin

clincial courses until he has passed his required anatomy and physiology courses. Physiology is continued into the third and fourth years in the form of "applied physiology" courses.

Wilburt C. Davison, Dean of Duke University School of Medicine, spoke on "An M.D. Degree Five Years after High School." His thesis is to select students with adequate training in college physics, chemistry, biology, and English on the basis of character, intelligence, and determination. He pointed out that four or more years in college are not an index necessarily of one's ability to make a good doctor. Culture is frequently not acquired by going to college. A reading knowledge of French and German should either not be required or the student should be forced to use that knowledge after entering the medical school. With present-day journals and abstract columns, a reading knowledge is not necessary for a student of medicine; it is necessary only for investigators. Dr. Davison believes that an extra two years of college often does harm to the student because it tends to develop academic indolence; the student chooses easy subjects and loses interest in what he does take. He would reduce the present four years of the study of medicine to three years by using the quarter system and by recommending attendance for the four quarters of each calendar year. This would give the student eight weeks of vacation which is adequate. The four quarter system has the advantages of preventing a disturbance of "intellectual pace" which is caused by a long vacation and of making it possible for the student to study cases that occur chiefly during the summer months. If it should be a physical strain on the student, such a student probably should not study medicine because of physical unfitness for the practice of medicine.

Dean Charles R. Bardeen, of the University of Wisconsin, told of the preceptorship that is now being used during part of the fourth year of medicine. The students are assigned to selected practitioners and accompany the preceptor on visits and assist him at his office.

Dean Irving S. Cutter, of Northwestern University, told how the outpatient department might be used to teach medicine as it is or should be practiced in the physician's office. In the dispensary the student may see the beginning of disease, learn how to manage patients, develop resourcefulness, work rapidly and accurately with the least equipment, and study and observe the effect of treatment. The good teacher has the opportunity to, and will, train good teachers in the dispensary.

The importance of the autopsy to the investigator and to the student was explained, and the reasons for the existing popular aversion to autopsies were sympathetically presented. With proper cooperation of medical school and the public in this matter, the work of the teacher and the investigator should be greatly facilitated.

Secretary Harold Rypins, of the Board of Medical Examiners of the State of New York, was of the opinion that state medical boards should cease most of their educational activity and perform more actively their police function. He believes that the educational function should be delegated to the American Association of Medical Colleges and that the state boards of health should follow their recommendations. He pointed out that eleven million dollars was being expended to produce qualified practitioners, whereas less than one-tenth of that amount was being expended to produce unqualified persons or "quacks." Under the recent New York law one thousand unqualified persons were eliminated.

C. R. Compton, Chairman, Committee on Uniform Blanks, American Association of Collegiate Registrars, showed how the adoption of uniform blanks for stating the premedical qualifications of students and applicants for licenses would reduce the wholly unnecessary complexity of a registrar's work. In his discussion, E. S. Elwood, of the National Board of Medical Examiners, indicated that adoption of such blanks would also greatly facilitate the work of the national and state examining boards.

The papers and the subsequent discussion showed a radical divergence of opinion as to the utility of requiring all applicants for licenses in the individual states to pass examinations in the basic sciences. It was pointed out that the introduction of these laws has greatly increased the expense and inconvenience to applicants.

President Robert E. Vinson, of Western Reserve University, outlined the needs of a growing medical school as a nucleus for a medical center; association with a university, with a dental school, a school of nursing, a school of pharmacy, a post-graduate school, hospitals, libraries, and museums.

Fred C. Zapffe, Secretary of the Association of American Colleges, made the point that state boards should be more lenient in the requirements for medical licensure in order to permit certain worthy experiments with the curriculum in medical colleges of recognized standing.

**COPYRIGHT LEGISLATION.**—The Council has voted to support a bill (H. R. 9586) introduced in Congress to make the United States eligible for membership in the International Copyright Union. It is hoped that Chapters and individual members will express their interest to their representatives or to Hon. A. H. Vestal, chairman of the Committee on Patents.

**MEMBERSHIP LIST.**—The Editors regret that through an error at the printers, pages 62 and 63 of the January *Bulletin* were accidentally exchanged. The names on page 62 belong to the list of members "not in university connection or at institutions not on the official list." The list of "honorary members," beginning on page 63, is continued on page 64.



## REVIEWS

RESEARCH IN THE HUMANISTIC AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, by Frederic Austin Ogg, The Century Company. AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, by David Allan Robertson, Charles Scribner's Sons.

To understand and appreciate for our purposes the significance of these two very important studies, some preliminary considerations are essential. Two of the most notable developments of the past fifteen years are the formation of national agencies for coordinating related fields of knowledge and the conducting of fact-finding surveys for making invoices and evaluating these fields of knowledge. These developments have been the result in part of a normally more comprehensive approach to problems; but primarily they were accentuated by the War. Take the four outstanding national agencies of this type as illustrations. The National Research Council, the central coordinating body today for mathematical, physical, and biological sciences in matters of survey and research, "was established by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916, at the request of President Wilson, as a measure of national preparedness." "The American Council on Education, a principal function of which is 'to stimulate research by the creation of active committees to conduct cooperative investigations in various fields' was organized to meet national needs during the World War, and afterwards was reconstructed and broadened with a view to permanent service in time of peace." In 1923 there was formed the Social Science Research Council for the purpose of encouraging, coordinating, and aiding research "in connection with interests and undertakings cutting across two or more main fields" of social sciences and of making a "systematic scrutiny of contemporary political, social, and economical conditions, with a view to discovering outstanding research needs and formulating major research undertakings." Finally, the American Council of Learned Societies, a "federation of fifteen learned organizations devoted to humanistic and social sciences was formed in 1919 (incorporated in 1923) primarily with a view to bringing into existence a unified organization capable of representing American scholarship in the recently established International Union of Academies. This function has been continuously and adequately performed in the past eight years. Quite apart from the international aspects of scholarship, however, the Council soon found a large field

of usefulness in bringing the separate organizations of historians, economists, political scientists, sociologists, archaeologists, philologists, and philosophers into closer relations and promoting the interests of several groups on cooperative lines and in ways hardly within reach of the societies individually; indeed, the original object, while by no means lost sight of, may be said to have become a detail in this larger problem or task."

Hence, it is natural that Dr. Ogg's study listed above, made possible by a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation, should represent a recent major activity of the American Council of Learned Societies. For just as a notable characteristic of the present age in the intellectual as well as in the industrial world is comprehensive, consolidating activity, so a great need is a knowledge of just what work is under way or contemplated in a given field.

Plans (of the Council) had not been developed far before it became apparent that intelligent support of the true interests of creative learning presupposed a familiarity with existing research agencies and activities which no known person or organization could claim to possess, and accordingly the suggestion was made that the Council should undertake a comprehensive survey of the existing state of research in humanistic and social sciences, with a view to finding out what research organizations and facilities exist, what research projects are in progress or in prospect, under what favorable or unfavorable conditions such projects are carried forward, and what steps are necessary to be taken if advances in the humanities (including, of course, the social sciences) are in coming years to be in any degree commensurate with those almost daily recorded in the domains of natural science.

Despite two long quotations, the objects and matters of this survey are best presented concisely in Dr. Ogg's own words:

The objects in mind were (1) to obtain as complete a picture as possible of the condition of research at the present time. . . (2) to reveal existing obstacles to fruitful research, to contribute to a visualization of research needs, and to stimulate interest in quarters where it is at present lacking or flagging, whether among university professors and administrators, non-academic organizations that have to do with large matters of human well-being, or individuals and corporations that would be glad to devote means and energy to the support of scholarship if only the need and the way were pointed out; (3) to reduce the handicap from which the humanistic and social sciences have heretofore suffered through the too rigid separation of their various fields, by bringing the work of one field to the atten-



tion of workers in other fields, and by revealing overlappings of effort, gaps that should be closed up, and opportunities for helpful cooperation; (4) to assemble a body of data which can be made to serve as the starting point of concerted efforts to maintain hereafter a continuous comprehensive record of humanistic and social research and its results; (5) to suggest and provoke more intensive studies of particular research problems. . . ; and (6) to make the scholarly work of America better known abroad, thereby lessening the danger of wasteful duplication and, indeed, inviting fruitful cooperative effort.

In bare enumeration (the matters included in the report) are: (1) the research interests, agencies, activities, and programs of learned societies, national and local; (2) the status of universities as research centers, with particular reference to modes of encouraging and assisting research work; (3) the position of research in the college, as distinguished from the university, and the very special problem that development of research in this type of institution presents; (4) the origins, growth, resources, equipment, interests, present undertakings, and contemplated activities of institutes, bureaus, foundations, and other organizations specially designed to carry on research work; (5) the research interests, facilities, and activities of a long and varied list of social, philanthropic, reform, and other sorts of committees, societies, and federations; (6) the research projects and programs of business concerns, financial institutions, and commercial and industrial organizations; (7) the research work of the national government; (8) research which is being done or planned by individual scholars, working privately; (9) the stage or status at which research has arrived in each of the seven branches of learning under view, with attention especially to current tendencies and needs; (10) the modes and amounts of assistance given research by the great foundations and endowments, including the fields and forms of inquiry in which each of these organizations is specially interested; (11) fellowships, prizes, grants in aid, and other forms of pecuniary assistance to, or rewards of, research; (12) libraries (university, public, and special) as depositories of research materials; and (13) the problem of adequate provision for prompt and suitable publication of the results of research work.

A bibliography of sixteen pages and an index of seven are commendable features of the volume.

Of more than passing interest to the American Association of University Professors are a list of reports in the bibliography of Committees G and R, on research, and several citations in the index of kindred activities of the Association. It is most pertinent in this connection for our members to recall that Committee R—On the Encouragement of University Research—has for ten years been actively engaged in consideration of the problem involved in this

Report; and, further, to recall that Professor Oldfather, the chairman, at the Chicago meeting in 1925, presented a report,<sup>1</sup> the high point of which "was a resolution calling for a 'fact-finding survey' of the status of humanistic research in the United States as a prerequisite to any intelligent effort to put humanistic scholarship on an improved basis." The committee pointed out that the cost of such a survey would be prohibitive for the Association and recommended that this body "direct the executive committee to bring the matter to the attention of 'the recognized national agency or agencies that, in its judgment, would be most competent and best fitted to conduct such a survey in the near future.' Attention was called to a request on similar lines recently directed to the trustees of the Carnegie Corporation by the American Council of Learned Societies—a request which eventuated in the survey described in the present volume. The committee's report was adopted by the Association and made a matter of record, but it was decided that no steps should be taken toward launching a survey until the investigation by the American Council of Learned Societies, then about to be started, should have been brought to completion."

Then at the Philadelphia meeting of the Association in December, 1926, "the chapters in the various colleges and universities were asked to give thought to the subject, and, in particular, to report to the committee the prevailing views concerning (1) the danger that research will gradually be drawn off from academic into non-academic institutions, (2) the likelihood that, in such an event, the burdens of teaching and administration will be markedly increased for the individual instructor, and (3) the probability that 'a reduction in the amount of research conducted in the physical and natural sciences in the universities and colleges will entail a corresponding reduction of support for research in the humanistic subjects without a compensating increase in such support from the side of extra-academic agencies.'"

It remains for the reviewer to cull from the chapters of more general interest some of the suggestions or facts of most significance for the Association. Under "Research in the United States," Dr. Ogg calls attention to the meagreness of first-rate American contributions to philosophy, philology, political science, and even history and economics, stating further that "a considerable portion of the studies undertaken are ill-planned, crudely executed, and barren of signifi-

<sup>1</sup> For complete report see *Bulletin* xii, 122-129 (Feb.-March, 1926)

cant results." The basis of his survey of universities as research centers is the group of twenty-six institutions now belonging to the Association of American Universities. His statement of the three main points of agreement as to the function of a university is worthy of place here: (1) the function of a university is twofold, *i. e.*, "to give instruction in the accumulated knowledge of the past and to contribute in a positive way to the enlargement of the frontier of knowledge;" (2) "research and teaching are inter-dependent;" (3) "the research obligations of the university are twofold—first, to train young investigators of promise, and, second, to carry on active programs of investigative work." He states further "if a fourth agreed point were to be added, it would perhaps be that on account of the number of potential investigators assembled, their opportunities for contact, and the scope and variety of their interests, the university is peculiarly adapted to carry on investigations in fields where branches or subjects of learning impinge upon one another." As examples of significant developments in certain universities he selects Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Yale, and North Carolina. It is notable that the last of these is the single representative of the state university in the group. His justification of this selection is important:

By common agreement, the inspiration of these significant meetings, as well as the leadership in the new research movement in the South, is traceable to one institution, and to certain men and women in it, namely, the University of North Carolina. The explanation of this leadership seems to lie in an unusually keen appreciation of the possibilities of service to the people of the state, in the presence in the faculty of many vigorous, ambitious, and productive scholars, and in liberal support of research interests by the administrative authorities, facilitated, no doubt, by the notable economic and industrial development which the state has of late experienced.

One of the most progressive suggestions in the chapter on developments in certain universities is that of the organization of groups in the university into research institutes as is now being done at the University of Chicago. Possibly one sentence from "Research Needs in the University" will disturb the self-satisfied and complacent:

The European scholar continues to bring the charge against American creative learning that too much of its effort is consumed by myopic investigation of small and narrow topics—that it is not sufficiently devoted to large projects carried out in a large way.

And the *college* teacher may read with satisfaction, cynical pessimism, or disagreement his arguments for the encouragement of research among *college instructors*. The main body of the book is an indispensable cyclopedia of information concerning organizations devoted to research and to endowments. It is natural and essential that a section of the survey should be devoted to libraries. A concluding chapter on fellowships, etc., should be helpful especially to graduate students and younger instructors.

Dr. Ogg and the American Council of Learned Societies are to be commended for this well-organized and comprehensive report. We now wait in turn for the next report soon to be completed under the auspices of the Council, by its permanent Secretary, Dr. Waldo G. Leland—an extensive survey of learned societies in the humanistic and social fields. But we may prophesy that even after that there will still be enough gleanings to justify further activities of our Committee R—On the Encouragement of Research.

The second book, *American Universities and Colleges*, is more limited in one respect than the first in that it concerns only colleges and universities; but in another respect it is more far-reaching and much more widely useful. It should appeal not only to college and university presidents and faculties but also to secondary school principals and teachers; to all students, undergraduates and graduates, and prospective students; and to parents intending to send their children to colleges:

It is the purpose of this book to portray in one volume a reliable picture of the present resources of universities and colleges in the United States. Such a picture should not only help answer present questions. It should also prove suggestive of ways and means of improving institutions of higher education.

Part I enables the reader to understand the organization of education in the United States and the character and relations of college, university, professional school, and graduate school of arts and sciences. From these chapters the reader will derive a point of view and criteria which will enable him to evaluate the facts presented in Chapter VI and Part II.

For Part II each of the universities and colleges on the accredited list of the American Council on Education in 1927 has prepared an exhibit of its general character and resources. The real values so important in education cannot be set forth in such data as dollars of annual expenditures or acres of land. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the facts presented will be recognized as significant of increased power to achieve the higher values for which universities exist.

If the reader turns to the first four chapters as one of the audience whom Dr. Robertson apparently had primarily in mind, he will imagine himself a foreigner who knows little or nothing about our higher educational institutions but who desires in brief space an adequate and more or less personal introduction to them. He will find, for example, a simple, clear, direct summary of the organization of education in the United States; definitions of the terms "American college" and "American university;" a statement of admission requirements to the college and to the graduate school; packed epitomes of endowments. He will see in a comprehensive glance something of the half-discerned strivings in the United States toward a common external objective, something of the discordant, inconsistent, disparate elements in our higher education. He will read with amazement concerning our "diploma mills." His sense of humor may be aroused by such passages as the following:

The market for teachers in the United States is imperfectly organized. There is no season for employment, except that April seems to be the month when most arrangements are made for the ensuing year. The annual meetings of the learned societies, the programs of which have come to be heavily laden with papers by young scholars put forward by professors proud of their students, have become a sort of annual fair for the display of promising doctors of philosophy. Otherwise there is no open competition either for places or candidates. It is notable that there is no frank public advertising of vacancies in colleges and universities such as appears constantly in the British journals. Nor is there the frank and honorable application which is usual in England. Indeed in some cases application has been enough to condemn a candidate. The conventions at present seem to require the advancement of a person's interest by a third party.

*The Yell.*—The American passion for organization has brought under subjection even the individual student's desire vocally to express his approbation of a person or deed. . . . At football games. . . a "cheering section" of students leads the rest of the assemblage like a choir; and in front of the "rooters" a cheer leader, conspicuously garbed in white sweater and white trousers, conducts the cheer with signs that have become elaborated like a tribal ritual. And the end for which all this machinery exists is the strenuous and tremendous emission of noise in unison—a college yell, which like a hymn or prayer of all the people unites the college and is not without its effect on the players.

Concerning the student comic publications:

Those interested in understanding the attitude of the American student will do well to remember that in no field is convention—as



to subject and treatment—more established and nowhere does flaming youth more clearly exhibit its desire to be thought naughtier than it really is.

#### College Annual:

In the college annual the literary feature has retreated to the back of the book, so that advertisements may be placed opposite reading matter; and art is represented by amateur pen-and-ink illustrations of student pulchritude and professorial ugliness.

If he is a prospective graduate student, he may read twice this last item concerning the oral examination for the degree:

In some institutions and in some departments the examination is conducted with great formality, cap and gown being required. In other cases the chairman of the department has been known to use every possible means to set the candidate at his ease, contributing to the informality of the occasion by providing a box of cigars to be smoked during the examination.

Chapters V and VI will be most valuable to those interested in professional training and other kinds of special graduate study. Chapter V consists of a comprehensive survey of the various kinds of professional schools ranging from Agriculture to Theology. Chapter VI gives one the best single basis accessible for an evaluation of departments for graduate study in the United States. In this connection there is an unfortunate omission. The chapter opens with the story and the record of the ranking of graduate departments as conducted by President Hughes in 1924, when he was president of Miami University. Since the rating gave Harvard first in Philosophy, second in Psychology, and third in Education, it is a bad gap from the point of view of a handbook or encyclopedia to have no information listed concerning these Harvard departments, in the succeeding pages devoted to the three subjects mentioned.

Part II is the section to which the professor will turn to beguile himself in hours of idleness or weariness. Here he will find the academic Baedeker, the "Who's Who" of all the universities and colleges on the accredited list of the American Council on Education. But more to the point, prospective students, parents, teachers, administrative officers, and special committees who have been able to secure certain essential information only by burrowing through stacks of catalogues will hail this admirably succinct, amazingly informing, and excellently organized body of material with joy and relief. It contains about everything that the idly curious or the intelligently

inquiring desire to know about the institutions listed. An excellent index of fifteen pages in fine print adds greatly to the usability of this volume. Another item worthy of mention is the appendices containing in part information concerning the American Council on Education, lists of colleges and universities approved by different national or sectional academic organizations, and a list of fellowships or scholarships open to students from different foreign countries.

Within the limits of the reviewer's knowledge, this is the most widely useful and valuable single book which has recently appeared concerning higher education in the United States.

THE AMERICAN AND THE GERMAN UNIVERSITY, by Charles Franklin Thwing, The Macmillan Company.—Dr. Thwing has written widely, interestingly, and instructively concerning college and university education in the United States. In the present volume he has chosen another topic of significance and importance. Especially is it a pertinent one, since the close of the hundred years 1915 marked the ebbing if not the passing of a dominant foreign influence in our whole educational system. Dr. Thwing's purpose "is to discover, and to measure, the worth of the contributions made by the German university, in the last hundred years, to the higher education in the United States." As he outlines in his introductory chapter the influence of the German university in America, he finds that it "has taken on, in the course of a hundred years, at least three special and distinct forms: first, the advantages it has given to American youth matriculating in its classes; second, the influence which native Germans—doctors of their universities—have had as teachers in American colleges; and, third—of a wholly different zone—the influence of German university methods, forces, and conditions, over the teaching given and over the methods and conditions prevailing in American institutions." In sequence he devotes a chapter to the first four American students in German Universities—Everett, Ticknor, Bancroft, Cogswell; one to a summary of American students in German universities; another to six great German teachers in American universities—Lieber, Follen, von Holst, Schaff, Michaelson, and Francke; two to the German university in its various aspects; and a final chapter on the future. Space does not permit quoting his comprehensive summary of reasons for and against the probable return of the dominant influence of the German University over the American. His conclusion follows:



As one weighs the reasons for, and the reasons against, the conclusion that the German century in American college and university life will not soon or again return, is not the verdict inevitable that the century which has just ended will not come back? That century will stand alone as an era distinct and complete, rich and enriching, in the history of the higher education.

HOW TO STUDY IN COLLEGE, by Leal A. Headley, Henry Holt and Co.—Instructors and committees who have the task of outlining the traditional type of orientation course for freshmen will find it worth-while to examine this book by Professor Headley of Carleton College. The material is assembled under fourteen "How's," having to do with physical and mental fitness, developing intellectual powers of various sorts, familiarizing oneself with the library, acquiring ability to meet an examination and to invest one's time to good advantage.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.—R. C. Angell, *The Campus*, Appleton and Company; Ernest De Witt Burton, *Education in a Democratic World*, University of Chicago Press; Nelson A. Crawford, *A Man of Learning*, Little, Brown; T. W. Goodspeed, *Ernest De Witt Burton*, University of Chicago Press; Jacob G. Meyer, *Small Colleges and Teacher Training*, Public School Publishing Co.; Herbert N. Shenton, *The Practical Application of Sociology*, Columbia Univ. Press; M. J. Van Wagenen, *A Teachers' Manual in the Use of the Educational Scales*, Public School Publishing Co.; *Who's Who in Education*, edited by G. E. Bowman and Nellie C. Ryan, Greeley, Colo.

## ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES<sup>1</sup>

STUDENTS AND THE ADMINISTRATION.<sup>2</sup>—I believe strongly that conference with undergraduates is important for mutual understanding, and that such conference should not be limited to student officers. One should begin establishing relations in the freshman year. Recognizing the difficulty of transition from high school to college, we make earnest and almost desperate attempts to start freshmen right. We have "freshmen weeks," orientation courses, and special meetings in which we drown them with advice, most of it not needed immediately at the beginning of the year, but most of it given then. Freshmen should have some one—officer, adviser, or whoever it may be from the faculty—who is genuinely interested in them (not merely officially conscientious), and who will take the pains to know them. They need not perfunctory assignment to courses that don't conflict but discussion of courses with a view to the future. They need to be shown that not merely education credits but both a background of general knowledge and substantial work in one subject are necessary for the prospective teacher; that a student planning to major in science should elect French and German. They need some one to whom they can turn to straighten out the confusion of the first days and start them right in attitude and methods of work; some one with whom to talk things out when problems arise which are serious and which seem to them unique, but which in reality are nearly universal. A flood of advice at the beginning, followed by neglect, will not do. They need repetition later of things heard in the first few days, but not then applicable and so forgotten.

Perhaps some one may say that students no longer wish advice from their elders. I do not know what the experience of others may be, but I have not found this to be true. Though there is sometimes a pose of indifference on the surface, underneath they are not only eager to talk about themselves and their problems, but grateful for interest shown and usually quite as open-minded as older people—faculty, parents, graduates, or even college presidents. For such help, students need a person interested in them as human beings, not buried in a corner of his own field of knowledge. As a boy once said, with unconscious inspired inaccuracy, one of the first requisites in a teacher is "personal magnitude." Nor is the benefit from such

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from Report of the *Bulletin of Association of American Colleges*, vol. xiv, no. 2

<sup>2</sup> Presidential address, Annual Meeting

conference on one side only. The understanding that it gives of student attitude, student problems, the student mind, should produce better teaching and better understanding of the problems that the administration must face in its work of education. You can't handle human beings wisely in education or anything else without understanding *them*, as well as the subject which you are trying to give them. To understand students, you must know what they are thinking, and there is no way to do that satisfactorily without personal contacts with them. Student periodicals, which try very hard to say something that shall be original or startling, do not accurately represent the thought of the mass of undergraduates. The chronic kicker, the petition circulated and obligingly signed by multitudes who care nothing for what it asks, are worth looking up. One needs to know how far they represent student attitude, since they may give opportunity for straightening out misapprehensions on the part of individuals or groups; but they seldom represent the majority. One should have all possible angles, but one particularly needs to know which is the prevailing attitude on the part of the leaders. . .

I do not believe that any student group should have control of the more serious cases of discipline. So much is involved in the offender's future that people who have seen more of the world need their wisest judgment in deciding. It is not fair to the culprit, to his parents, or to the student board itself, to put such weight of decision on less experienced people. . .

Two policies which seem equally good on paper or in the study may leap far apart when one gets human reaction on them. Such reaction should come not merely from the unusual individual, self-appointed or otherwise, who comes, with or without real material, to the office. One must definitely make a business of seeing at fairly frequent intervals the students who can give what one needs to know, and who if such appointments are not definitely made, stay away through thoughtlessness or through fear of taking one's time. . .

LUCIA R. BRIGGS, Milwaukee-Downer College

COOPERATION OF TRUST COMPANIES WITH COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—Higher education in the United States costs in the aggregate a large sum of money. The latest report of the Federal Government available indicates that for the fiscal year 1923-24 the operating cost in round numbers was \$260,000,000. Since that date the expenses have increased because of a greater number of students and

higher salaries, so that \$300,000,000 would probably be the cost at present. These expenses are met from three principal sources:

- (1) Fees paid by students.
- (2) Federal, state, and municipal grants.
- (3) Private philanthropy:
  - (a) Current gifts.
  - (b) Income on endowment (gifts previously made for capital).

Approximately one-fourth of the annual cost is met through private philanthropy past and present. In 1923-24 gifts to higher institutions of learning were reported aggregating \$81,734,738, of which \$46,726,677 was for endowment to provide an income in perpetuity, \$22,632,735 was for new plant, and \$12,375,326 was for current expenses.

The value of the physical property of these institutions exceeds one billion dollars, and in addition their endowment is worth about a billion dollars. The endowment and physical property of the privately supported institutions are due to philanthropy.

The questions may be raised, in fact are being raised, whether private philanthropy should be asked to carry an increasing part of the growing cost of higher education, as the desire for it increases, and the facilities for furnishing it are extended, or whether we have reached the place where the full cost or a greater portion should be borne by other persons and agencies. Admitted that in a democracy the door of educational opportunity should be open to all, should not that opportunity be provided by the state, and in case of privately supported institutions should not the students themselves be required to pay a fee sufficient to cover the cost of their education? These are pertinent questions and are now receiving earnest consideration. Whatever the final answer may be, and however freely the state offers higher education to its citizens, it is the opinion of the profoundest students of the subject, that a properly balanced system of higher education requires privately supported as well as state supported institutions. In the privately supported ones students may properly be asked to pay a greater part of the cost than at present, and those financially able may justly be required to pay the full cost of their education, but it is generally conceded that there is and will be for many generations to come a real need for gifts to these institutions. Gifts are needed to provide additional buildings and equipment; to establish endowments for aid to worthy students

of meagre financial resources, in the form of loans and scholarships; for research and publications to extend the boundaries of knowledge; and for music, art, and esthetic subjects of general culture which might not be included in the curriculum if they depended upon student fees or the state for support.

TREVOR ARNETT

**COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION.**—Let us summarize as briefly as possible the major findings of the Commission.

The cost of educating a student in the junior and senior years of a four-year college is on an average seventy per cent greater than the cost of educating a student in the freshman and sophomore years of a four-year institution.

For the thirty-two accredited institutions the average cost per student is \$266 for strictly educational purposes. This includes expenditures for instruction, for administration, and for operation and maintenance of the physical plant.

Students' tuitions and fees in the thirty-two accredited institutions amount to sixty-two per cent of the expenditures for strictly educational purposes of these institutions. The range in the percentages which students pay of the cost of their education is very large. At one institution in Kentucky students pay only twenty-six per cent of the cost of their education; this represents one extreme. The other extreme is represented by an institution in Indiana which charges students ninety-four per cent of the cost of their education. The income which the group of institutions receives from endowment is thirty-one per cent of the expenditure for educational purposes.

In the accredited institutions for the school year 1925-26 the average salary for all full-time members of the teaching staffs, for all ranks combined, was \$2464. At the institution paying the lowest salaries, the average salary was only \$1969; at the institution paying the highest salaries, the average was \$3426. The average salary of all staff members for non-accredited institutions included in this report was approximately \$300 lower than the average for all accredited institutions. However, I should like to point out that the institution paying next to the highest average salary, is a non-accredited institution. The range in salaries received by full-time staff members was from \$800 for the most poorly paid instructor giving full time to the institution, to \$10,000 for the most highly paid professor who was not an administrative officer. The more recent figures show



that the average salary for the school year 1927-28 for those institutions holding membership with the North Central Association is almost \$200 higher than the average salary for the same institution in 1925-26. . . The correspondence between average faculty salaries and income received from student tuitions is as close as the correspondence between faculty salaries and income received from endowment. The amount colleges may spend for salaries does not appear to be even remotely related to the source from which their income is derived. The institution which pays the highest average salary to its teachers and also provides the most costly education of all the institutions represented has practically no endowment; the institution ranking second both with respect to expenditures per student and to salaries of teachers has a very large endowment. . .

The fourteenth point is also an answer to a specific question. The question reads: Do the present financial requirements result in a satisfactory salary scale? The answer of the Commission to this question is also "No." In a number of institutions the present financial requirements of standardizing agencies do not result in a satisfactory salary scale for teachers. Three of the thirty-two accredited institutions have average annual salaries for full-time faculty members below \$2000, six of the institutions have average annual salaries below \$2100, and eight of the institutions, constituting one-fourth of the total number, have average annual salaries below \$2200. (I may say that these are the figures for the school year 1925-26. It should be remembered that the average annual salary of teachers has increased \$200 during the past two years.) The Commission is of the opinion that an efficient teaching staff cannot be maintained at an average salary lower than \$2200. We think that is conservative.

The facts which have been presented show that the present financial requirements of standardizing agencies are not such as to guarantee an expenditure per student which is adequate for effective work; also they are not such as to guarantee a salary scale which is adequate to enable institutions to obtain the services of well qualified staff members. Since there is little relationship between the per cent of income received from endowment and factors such as salaries and costs per student, the remedy certainly does not consist of further increases in endowment requirements. It is the opinion of this Commission that a means of remedying this situation would be through the development of standards relating to expenditures per student and salaries of members of teaching staffs, and possibly to a

strengthening of the standards relating to faculty qualifications.

F. W. REEVES, University of Kentucky

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE.—At a meeting of this Association held one year ago, there were present three representatives from the American Association of University Professors. These representatives in reporting to their own Association at its recent annual meeting, December 30, 1927, at Cincinnati, made very pleasing reference to the reception which had been given to them by this Association and to the fact that there seems to be a very excellent spirit of good-will and cooperation existing between college administrators and college teachers. The University Professors had, through the Secretary of this Association, invited this Association to send delegates to their Association meeting in Cincinnati. Dr. Kelly asked Dean Chandler, of the University of Cincinnati, and the Chairman of this Commission to attend the meeting. We both were present, were cordially received and our greetings from this Association were graciously entertained. In discussing the conventions which this Association has adopted, we found that the other Association had adopted also the same resolutions, although they hope that in time we may go further in outlining methods whereby machinery may be set up in different institutions for the realization of the principles we have announced. Evidently there is lurking in the minds of some college professors the notion that college executives are arbitrary, dictatorial, and not always open and fair in their work of administration. In presenting the greetings from this Association I pointed out to the University Professors that a college president is primarily the executive officer of the board of trustees and that the board of trustees expected certain things from him, and in trying to interpret these minds it frequently did appear that he might be arbitrary, when after all he was simply carrying out instructions from the board of trustees. They very readily saw that and discussed it, and came to the point of view that there were problems that faced the administrator as well as those that faced the professor. It is thought that our approaches toward each other through our respective organizations, presenting fully all difficulties which face us and seeking methods for the eradication of differences, will eventually bring to the college professor that freedom and security which we all seek for him in order that there may be the fullest possible pursuit of knowledge and truth.



Your Commission recommends for the purpose of fuller and better understanding by our boards of trustees that the Commission again ask the college presidents to present our resolutions of 1925 to their boards and that copies of the resolutions be sent immediately to the presidents for this purpose.

I think that we ought to rejoice in the fact that the Association of University Professors is trying to be eminently fair to administrators. One of the problems that they took up at the Cincinnati meeting was: What moral obligation is upon us, as professors, to give full warning to the administration of an institution of our desire to leave it, so that we do not embarrass the institution by our leaving? So we are working toward the same ends. The main thing, I think, now, is that we educate ourselves and our boards of trustees as fully as possible to the way in which academic freedom for our professors in their work of research and in their work of teaching may be made entirely open and they may feel secure.

W. W. BOYD, Western College for Women

ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS.—Your Commission augmented by the representatives from the Association of American Universities held their first meeting on May 3, 1927, when a careful review of the year's work was made and plans for future study were formulated. It was decided to ask the American Council on Education either through its own agencies or, if the Council thought best, through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching or some other Foundation, to gather further information along the following lines:

(a) During the period 1921-26, what proportion of college graduates entered graduate schools with the intention of preparing for college teaching?

(b) During this same period, what proportion of the highest ranking college graduates, say those graduating in the upper quarter of the class, have entered or are preparing to enter graduate schools with the intention of fitting themselves for college teaching?

(c) What proportion of college graduates who possess in addition to high scholarship other desirable personal qualities are preparing for the profession of college teaching?

(d) Is there reason to believe that a smaller proportion of college graduates of high scholastic standing and possessing exceptional

personal qualities are preparing to enter college teaching now than prior to 1917?

(e) Are the economic conditions and the attractions in college teaching today such as to encourage promising young men and women to enter the profession?

(f) Can the study of Phi Beta Kappa graduates be brought up to date so as to show what proportion of Phi Beta Kappa men and women are entering the profession of teaching?

We are very sorry to report that very little if any information was gathered from the sources to which we applied. The officers of the various organizations were apparently most willing to assist but frankly admitted that they had no agencies at their command through which they might secure the much needed material.

It was also voted to present a brief report of the work and plans of the Commission to the American Association of University Professors, to the American Association of University Women, and to other professional bodies with the request that these matters be brought to the attention of the local chapters for serious study and discussion. This report contained the following topics which we hoped might provoke discussion and arouse a new interest in the work of our commission:

(1) Should candidates for the doctorate, who are planning to enter the profession of teaching, be required to devote a part of their time to special preparation for teaching as distinguished from the study of their specialty and from training in research?

(2) If so, about how much of the candidate's time should be devoted to such preparation?

(3) By whom should instruction and training for his purpose be given? (a) By existing departments of education? (b) By special departments or professors of collegiate education? (c) By each department separately? or (d) By some other means?

(4) Can college teaching be materially improved if more attention is given to training teaching fellows and student assistants in methods of teaching their subjects?

(5) What should be the content of courses designed to afford preparation for college teaching?

(6) Is it desirable and practicable for graduate schools to offer differentiated courses of study for students qualified for teaching only and for those giving evidence of ability as original investigators

in their fields, and if so, should distinctive degrees be granted of these two types of graduates? . . .

During the year of study we have made a number of important observations and have arrived at a number of pretty definite conclusions. From all that we can learn there are no direct agencies at work which would tend to encourage college graduates to enter the profession of teaching. Furthermore, it is a grave question as to whether any direct agency can be devised, at least at the present time, which will accomplish anything in the way of recruiting desirable college teachers. The prospective teacher will lay more stress upon his own observations than upon any theories which may be presented by specially appointed recruiting officers. In fact, we cannot make much progress in interesting brilliant young men and women in the profession of teaching so long as conditions in the educational world remain as they are. In the first place, the general attitude of the American people toward education is far from ideal. We value education not for education's sake but rather for the practical use we may make of it. The great majority of men go to college not for mental growth and attainment but to make out of such mental equipment as they may have money-making machines. So long as this attitude exists no one can hope to make the profession of teaching very attractive to an ambitious youth.

We are often quoted as offering the greatest educational facilities in the world. We cite the millions we spend annually upon school buildings, grounds, and equipment in order to educate our youth and feel confident that we have done all that can be done. We are forgetting that the quality of the education which we offer will depend more upon the character of the teacher than upon any material equipment which we may provide, and that we have no right to expect good teaching without paying for it. The nation which properly values education will be willing to pay an honest price for the service of those who play such an important part in the process.

The man who gets a college education should be required to pay the teacher the actual cost of the service rendered. He will be obliged to do that for every other purchase which he may make in life. Why should he pay less than cost for the most valuable thing which he is able to secure?

The attitude and action of boards of trustees and college governing boards toward those on the teaching staff will have much to do with our success or failure in interesting promising college graduates in

the profession of teaching. These governing bodies do not always recognize the vital importance of promoting members of the staff and raising their salaries whenever such promotion in rank and salary is deserved through excellence of service either in teaching or in research. Governing boards apparently are not aware of the importance of making sufficiently liberal provision for sabbatic leave to make it possible for instructors and young professors to get away from their routine tasks at proper intervals and to take advantage of the many opportunities for study in other parts of the world.

Failure on the part of college governing bodies to recognize real worth in teaching and in research profoundly affects already not only the quality of teaching by members of faculties already in service but also the quality of teaching by members of faculties to be acquired. Capable young men will be much more inclined to select college teaching for their career when they know that meritorious work will be recognized and properly rewarded.

College authorities might be reminded that they would find it less difficult to speak when they wish to dismiss undesirable teachers if they show proper appreciation of genuine worth in those teachers who have demonstrated their value to the institution.

It is noticeable that the teacher, and particularly the professor, is held in much higher esteem in other countries than in the United States. This is due almost entirely to the disgracefully small salary which he receives and which makes it impossible for him to live as a man of his standing should live. A promising youth will not be tempted very strongly to spend ten to fifteen years and as many thousand dollars in preparation for a position which will not command the respect of those in the community in which he lives. It is simply useless to make any direct effort toward recruiting college teachers until we have succeeded in making some very radical changes in such conditions as we have outlined above.

The most direct agency which may be employed at the present time toward the enlistment of teachers for college work is the college professor himself who by his life, work, and example places the profession which he graces on the high plane where it belongs and in a favorable light when compared with other callings. This personal example is often so strong as to outweigh discouraging influences and to lead a man into service, come what will. Scores of college professors today will testify that they adopted their profession simply because of their admiration for some ideal professor and

the effective methods which he employed in teaching his subject.

The enlistment of good material for college teachers is a much more important preliminary to the work of training than might appear at first thought.

In the opinion of nearly all who have answered our questions, it is a waste of time to attempt to train for college teaching or any branch of teaching those who have not the ability and do not possess by nature those peculiar qualities which experience has shown are essential to success in teaching. In fact many have frankly stated that our first task is to discourage the clearly incapable and unpromising young men and women from making any attempt to prepare themselves for college teaching. The task of recruiting and selecting the best is a matter of no small importance and must be carefully considered before we can proceed with any degree of safety with the plans for training.

We find that little consideration has been given to the question of providing any special training for those who are planning to enter the profession of college teaching. There is a quite general belief that there are no agencies or institutions now in existence which are capable of rendering any safe assistance in this direction. In fact many educators claim that no such agency can be created. They firmly believe that after a man has completed his course in a graduate school he should be able to teach, and if he cannot there are no external influences which will give him that capacity.

We are not inclined to share these views. It may be that we have no acceptable agencies at our disposal at the present time, but it does not necessarily follow that none can be created. The main trouble is that there has been no demand for such agencies. We have lived under the erroneous assumption that method in college teaching was not of sufficient importance to demand any special consideration. It has been assumed that all that should be expected of a professor is that he shall know his subject, for under these conditions the transference of his knowledge of the subject-matter to the waiting pupil, which apparently is the only important obligation resting upon him, will automatically take care of itself. We have been inclined to overlook the larger mission of the teacher, which he is more likely to perform through the agency of his method of teaching than through his knowledge of the subject which he teaches. The teacher who looks upon his pupil simply as a mental receptacle



which is his sole duty to fill with knowledge is overlooking his great opportunity and his chief obligation. His task is not to encourage a merely receptive attitude on the part of the pupil but rather to arouse the youthful mind into life and action so that through this medium he may put into service those latent talents which he may possess. Mere knowledge of subjects which he has studied in college makes the graduate little better than an encyclopedia so far as the service which he will be able to render to his fellow men is concerned.

To say that a college teacher needs no particular training or is incapable of any special instruction in methods of teaching is just as ridiculous as to say that the painter, the sculptor, the musician, or the actor needs no instruction or training in the technique of his profession. Our greatest artists and best known actors have submitted to the severest types of discipline and training conducted by recognized masters in these professions. By this process each generation passes its accomplishments down to the succeeding generation. We must admit that there are relatively few masters in methods of teaching in whose hands we would care to place the prospective college teacher. But there are men of this type in every university. They are giving their attention to study and research which in the opinion of university authorities is of much more importance than instruction in methods of teaching. Sometime we may look upon method in teaching as of sufficient importance to search out these master teachers in the different college centers and assign to them the care of the recruits whom we are trying to persuade to enter our profession.

Answers to our numerous questions show a new and a widespread interest in methods of teaching and a general recognition of its significance in the education of youth. Educators all over the country have expressed their high approval of our efforts to discover means by which improvement in this direction may be accomplished. The great majority, however, are doubtful as to the probability of success. The members of your Commission are quite aware that we are in no position even to recommend any system of training or any institution of instruction which would meet the needs of the thousands of prospective teachers who are preparing to enter or who have already entered the field of college instruction. No one has the right to expect to accomplish a task of such great proportions and of such wide significance by one stroke or in a short period of time. No great changes in our educational policies have ever been accomplished

suddenly. If by our effort we may be able to make a beginning and somehow prepare the way for a gradual but sure development of an acceptable method of procedure, we shall feel that our services may not have been in vain. To accomplish even this we must first convince college educators that the work upon which we are engaged is of grave importance and is worthy of their keenest interest.

In connection with our investigation we have discovered that a great many college officials are under the impression that the methods of training adopted by graduate schools and schools of education of graduate rank are unsatisfactory and inadequate so far as they apply to the training of prospective college teachers. We believe the time has come when graduate schools and schools of education which have the capacity should give their best thought to the theory and practice of college teaching.

After two years of study and deliberation, your Commission has reached the point where we feel that the Association of American Colleges, under whose auspices we have been working, should be called upon to express its opinions emphatically. We therefore venture to make the following recommendations for your consideration and possible adoption:

1. That the action of the American Council on Education in appointing a special Central Committee to serve as a clearing house for the several groups now working on our problems be heartily endorsed by this Association.
2. That this Association urge upon the Central Committee the importance of enlisting the interest and cooperation of other organizations such as the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of University Women, etc., in a common effort toward an improvement in college teaching.
3. That this Association express to this Central Committee our earnest desire to cooperate in every possible way with any and all groups who may be studying the problem of college teaching.
4. That this Association request the Central Committee to consider the advisability of undertaking a comprehensive survey of existing conditions in the field of higher education, involving the use of one or more full-time men who have experience and vision and who may be able to gather much needed information by conference with college officers, teachers, and undergraduates throughout the country.
5. That this Association request the Central Committee to consider the advisability of enlisting the interest of some of the educational

foundations in the hope of securing from them financial support in an attempt to carry on the survey proposed above.

6. That this Association request the Central Committee to use their best effort in pointing out to the faculties of the colleges and graduate schools the importance of suggesting to promising students the advantages and opportunities of the college teaching career.

7. That this Association request the Central Committee to point out to boards of trustees or other college governing bodies that they can do much toward interesting young men and women in college teaching by making use of all agencies within their power toward an improvement in the welfare of the members of the teaching staff in their employ.

8. That this Association request the Central Committee to urge those institutions which are giving considerable attention to vocational guidance to lay more stress upon the importance of the profession of college teaching in the hope that this profession may be fairly presented in its relation to other callings.

9. That this Association request the Central Committee to act as a bureau of information and advice with the understanding that they are to receive and answer, to the best of their ability, all inquiries which may be made with reference to the enlistment and the training of college teachers and with the further understanding that they shall prepare and send to all interested colleges and graduate schools literature bearing upon the enlistment and training of college teachers, and call their attention to any literature upon this subject which has already been published.

10. That this Association ask the Central Committee to prepare a program of procedure which might be followed by colleges and graduate schools interested in the training of college teachers and to send this program to colleges and graduate schools generally.

11. That this Association ask the Central Committee to incorporate in this program the following suggestions in the hope of encouraging college and university faculties to do what they can in the way of self instruction:

- (a) Encourage discussions on proper methods of teaching in college.
- (b) Make proper provision for systematic supervision of teaching in the several departments of the college.
- (c) Give demonstrations of effective teaching in college.
- (d) Make provision for a series of experiments in which both the older and the younger members of the staff in a department may try

out various methods and plans of teaching the courses in that department and present the results of these experiments to the general faculty for consideration and discussion.

(e) Make provision for a series of exchange visitations in which the older professors may visit the classes of the younger instructors with the intention of criticising and suggesting, and in which the younger instructors may have the opportunity of visiting the classes held by their seniors, with the purpose of learning from those who have had larger experience and with the privilege of offering suggestions of their own.

(f) Encourage the establishment of assistantships and part-time instructorships for the benefit of graduate students who are planning to become college teachers and who are willing to do such work in connection with their graduate course.

(g) Encourage seniors in college and graduate students who are planning to enter the profession of college teaching to serve apprenticeships as teachers in the local secondary schools.

(h) Encourage the faculties of the colleges and the graduate schools to call upon capable and serious-minded students to make an honest and careful estimate of the teaching efficiency of the members of the faculty and to present their findings to the faculty.

12. That this Association ask the Central Committee to urge schools of education to give their best thought to the theory and practice of college teaching.

13. That this Association ask the Central Committee to urge the graduate schools to face the seriousness of the problem of efficient teaching in colleges in the hope that they may recast some of their methods and some of their ideals, and put forth their best efforts toward a study of effective college teaching in the various departments.

14. That this Association continue the study of the problem of the enlistment and the training of college teachers, and that it reappoint the old Commission or appoint a new Commission to carry forward the plans and recommendations now before us.

15. That this Association request the Association of American Universities to continue its cooperation with us during the coming year in this work, and to reappoint as its agents the three gentlemen who have rendered such valuable service during the past year.

O. E. RANDALL, Brown University

COLLEGE PERSONNEL TECHNIQUE.—1. It appears that of the institutions replying nearly forty do include something definite and specific beside scholastic considerations in the selecting among applicants for admission.

We noted in our report of last year that a large number of institutions listed character as one of the considerations taken into account. A number of others listed personality, general ability and fitness for college, health, leadership and participation in school life.

In the reports received this year we have much more detailed information regarding these matters, though methods of evaluating the data are not very clearly indicated in the reports.

Practically all of the institutions require detailed information regarding the character and quality of the candidate, and many of them indicate with some definiteness just what they mean by character and quality. The blanks used by half a dozen different colleges for this purpose list among them more than seventy qualities, most of these being mentioned by only one or two institutions. There are a few institutions which use approximately the same list, one of the earliest lists issued for the purpose.

Several colleges put a great deal of emphasis upon a personal letter which the candidate is required to send in his own handwriting. Writing and the style are regarded as possible sources of light on the quality of the student. He is usually asked in this letter to tell something of his history, his tastes, and his ambitions. A few institutions send a candidate a self-estimate blank on which he supplies to the best of his ability information regarding his preparation and his qualities.

Several colleges put considerable emphasis upon letters from alumni who have personal knowledge of the candidate. A few write fully to the candidate's references for detailed information regarding him.

Questions have sometimes been raised regarding the value of recommendations from principals, teachers, and personal acquaintances of the candidate. Most institutions seem to have a good deal of confidence in these reports. It seems safe to say that an adverse report upon a candidate is usually significant. Favorable reports are not always so reliable. . .

An increasing number of colleges are emphasizing the importance of the personal interview. Several require such interviews of all candidates. Candidates who are too far away to visit the college are interviewed at their schools by some representative sent from the



college or by some local alumnus. Colleges emphasizing the interview stress its great importance as a source of information regarding the student's character, personality, and promise. . .

By way of summary, I would say that these selective systems employ beside the usual scholastic considerations such items as an aptitude test, detailed reports from schools and other persons on the candidate's mental, moral, and social qualities, a personal letter from the candidate himself, and an interview with him, and that in general these systems are giving excellent results.

2. Our second question had to do with the matter of *student advisers* for freshmen.

While the results of these systems are not uniform and not always as good as is desired, the colleges concerned are in general very well pleased with their results.

Faculty advisers are not usually dispensed with but the older student is thought to be in a better position to understand some of the freshman's difficulties than is the faculty member.

3. The additional information received with regard to our third question, that having to do with the content and scope of survey courses, is interesting and significant. The courses are of several different types:

(1) One type is a course which attempts to give the student an orientation in the college. It may consist of information having to do with college life in general, or it may be somewhat narrower in scope and seek to present the ideals and offerings of the institution itself. In one case it is still narrower, and has for its purpose the guidance of the student in the technique of study and in the conduct of daily life.

(2) The second type of course is a general introduction to the curriculum. In some cases the course attempts to be a preface to the whole curriculum. In some cases it has to do primarily with the most important departments and it may also attempt to show the relations of the various elements of the curriculum to some of the more important vocations.

(3) The third type of course is a survey of a special field of knowledge such as literature, biology, mathematics, social science, philosophy, psychology.

(4) In the fourth type the course has as its aim a study of man in his physical and social environment. In some cases various subject matters are welded together so far as possible into one or two main

bodies of knowledge. In some of them there is a succession of subject matters without much attempt to introduce unity among them. The courses which have been most successful, so far as our data indicate, are courses which require thorough and systematic work on the part of the student in small classes under the direction of teachers who do very little if any lecturing, and who continue with the same sections throughout the year. There is great danger even in such courses that, instead of presenting to the student a series of significant related problems with introduction to the data for the solution of these problems and the suggestion of suitable methods for obtaining a solution, the course shall be simply a mass of subject matter with ready-made conclusions and with a tendency to deaden interest instead of stimulating it.

4. We did not receive a very considerable amount of valuable information regarding research in matters pertaining to the freshman year. A good many institutions are checking up on the use of tests of one kind or another, particularly psychological tests, and the correlation of the tests with college work. A number are studying freshman failures and the reasons for such failures. Several are giving attention to their program for freshman week and the results attained. Several are making a general study of their whole admission system. . .

The reports received by the Commission in the past four years contain a great deal of information which it has not been possible to embody in our reports. It seems to me that it would be highly desirable for someone, possibly a suitable candidate for a doctor's degree, to make a thorough-going study of all the data received, to supplement these data by further inquiries, and to publish the whole in a monograph.

It might well be worth-while for the successors of our present Commission to try to find out in some way what effect this whole development of personnel technique is having upon the student body. While most of us feel that the results are excellent, there are skeptics who think that the thing is being overdone; that there is danger of over-handling the student and of crippling his initiative and self-reliance. It is true that most of the skeptics seem to be in colleges which are not doing much in this direction and that most of those who have proved the pudding find it good. But the skeptics should have an opportunity to show whether or not they have a case.

It is, of course, true that unsatisfactory results in some cases would

not mean necessarily that the systems were faulty. They might result from poor administration. In general, the colleges which have reported to us believe strongly in the measures that have been taken to improve the quality of the student body and to make their college work more effective.

A. L. JONES, Columbia University

## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

BETTER ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN THE HIGH SCHOOL AND THE COLLEGE.<sup>1</sup>—While it is true that from the standpoint of the American high school in general, the fitting of students for college is quite an incidental task, it is assumed that the secondary schools represented in this group are primarily college preparatory schools.

As we appreciate more and more that it is not so much in our stars as in ourselves that we fall short of professional success, the disposition to pass on the blame for unsatisfactory conditions from the college to the high school, and from the high school to the elementary school, and from the elementary school to the now obsolete home or the nascent nursery school, is less in evidence. The colleges in particular, living as they do behind transparent walls, are less disposed than formerly to heave bricks in the direction of the high school. Much of the really remarkable vitality of many American colleges today is due to the success with which they have appropriated and adapted the philosophies, the methods of teaching, and the spirit of the best high schools.

When the colleges are driven, however, through questionnaires or other modern forms of academic torture, to point out the failures of the high school they are definite and consistent in their diagnoses. Many high school graduates do not know how to read or write the English language; they do not know how to study; they do not know how to think; they are lacking in earnestness—in purposefulness; they must be driven to their tasks; the quality and content of scholastic effort do not improve.

Incidentally, it is worthy of note that these same charges are made against the graduates of the colleges. It may serve to delimit our present problem somewhat to present the practical unanimity with which those who deal with both boys and girls certify to the apparent superiority of the girls, perhaps due to superior intelligence (or is it superior application to an assigned task?), a closer approach at a given age to mental maturity, less absorption in "activities," a greater willingness to study. On the whole, the girls are conscientious conformists, which may be faint praise.

The most aggravating symptom of all and the one most frequently cited is the inability of freshmen to read and write the English lan-

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered before the joint session of the National Association of Principals of Schools for Girls and the National Association of Deans of Women, Boston, Massachusetts, March 1, 1928

guage. The student under consideration is supposed to have reached the stage in his development in which most of his knowledge will be secured through the printed word. He is supposed to have largely passed through the stage of securing knowledge through imitation, and through verbal precepts and admonition, but is not yet ready for independent, much less creative, thinking. Perhaps "on the average" this is a correct diagnosis. But it assumes that potential creative development is not here manifest.

Now it is certain that for many students a deadly fallacy is lurking in this assumption. Why should all students postpone efforts to do some thinking on their own account until they are college juniors? May not the germ of independent thinking be discovered in the junior college period, or in the high school period? Why should all students be expected to keep step in the face of what we know of biological processes elsewhere? High school students, sitting on the same seat in the same class, are miles apart in everything of the spirit.

There is an increasing number of high school and college teachers who are disposed to throw students back more and more on their own resources, and within reasonable bounds to give them the air, who attempt to assist students in the discovery of their own interests and capacities, even by the trial and error method, if necessary, as a preliminary step to a profounder interpretation of the significance in their lives, and in the life of their day and generation, of these interests and capacities. This is the meaning of much that is going on in the effort to make adjustments in this twilight zone.

R. L. KELLY

ORGANIZATION AND PUBLICITY.<sup>1</sup>—The scholar has been described as one who "must wend alone, by his own light inspired." He shuns organizations; he admires it, if at all, at a distance. He fancies himself as one of the few free individuals left who can work without the control of a time-clock or the advice of an efficiency engineer. He usually lives, to be sure, in one of those vast and complicated organizations, a modern university, but he has learned to pick his way gingerly among the formidable machinery. He has found that, if he doesn't meddle with it, it will pay no attention to him. . . . As for publicity, who has avoided it more successfully than the scholar? . . . But the present age raises some question as to the virtue

<sup>1</sup> The Presidential address at the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, December 28, 1927



of solitariness and as to the desirability of hiding your light under a bushel. Therefore, I am venturing to ask whether scholarship . . . might not retain its independence and self-respect and yet come upon speaking terms with those masters of the modern world, organization and publicity? . . .

The multiplication of organization is already well under way. Following an American tendency, everyone who wishes to do something for scholarship starts a new organization and appeals for an endowment. Nearly every university supports a scholarly journal in the field of the modern languages; a number support several. If a university has no journal, it will at least possess a series of publications. Compare the situation here with that in England where the two university presses have long served scholarship. I do not know how many dozen university presses there are in the country today, but we may be sure that there will be more tomorrow. Now, no one wishes to curb the efforts of local patriotism or of generous benefaction in aiding the study of language and literature, least of all would I wish to say a word in criticism of the service of the universities in aiding scholarly publication, a service that is bound to take on increased dimensions in the future; but surely it is time that we had some clearing-house, some method of avoiding duplication, repetition, and damnable reiteration. One of the most practical steps in organizing would be to provide a central distributing agency for all publications in our field, avoiding unnecessary competition in the sales departments of our university presses, and serving the convenience of every purchaser. But beyond such practical assistance, every student is beginning to feel the need of a central bureau of information through which he may discover what has been doing and is being done by scholars the country over. It is as impossible as it is undesirable that in the future any single university will exercise a dominating influence in the scholarship of the modern languages. We may boast now as we could not have asserted forty or even twenty years ago, that in all parts of the country—East, West, North, and South—are universities whose faculties contain scholars of distinction in our field and whose students are offered an adequate initiation into our fellowship. But the strengthening of the universities does not tend to diminish rivalries, competition, and duplication of effort. The cause of learning in this country is threatened with injury from such overgrowth and dispersion. The sensible division of labor and the efficient cooperation of all can scarcely be obtained in any

other way than by the services of a general organization such as ours.

Scholarship has been increasing, I remarked, in quantity if not in quality. It is with quantity that organization has chiefly to do. The brilliant investigator may well go his own way; the eminent specialist has, of course, chosen his own work. But the rapid expansion of higher education in this country has multiplied teaching posts and given employment to hundreds of men and women interested in research, well-informed in what scholarship has already accomplished whose own investigations are marked by thoroughness and intelligence. Time past never saw so many college professors as we have now assembled in this country. Probably no other nation has so many persons competent to do scholarly work in the modern languages and literatures. What are they to do? That seems to me a question worthy of general consideration, requiring an answer made as a result of the amassed information and the collective wisdom of a general organization. Our present product as a whole does not inspire undue exhilaration. I must speak with diffidence, for I cannot pretend to have read thoroughly all our journals, but a casual examination of the titles leads me to suspect that many of the articles were written in response to the nagging of some college president who wishes his faculty to produce, or to pressure of some sort quite extraneous to the importance of the subject itself. I think of a number of books and articles produced by our members during the past few years of which we all ought to be proud, perhaps a greater number of valuable contributions than could be credited to any earlier period, but I do not recall any large cooperative work of importance. In spite of notable individual achievements, must we not agree that much of the scholarly product in our field is mediocre and miscellaneous? Such articles do no especial harm and perhaps increase the work for the bibliographers, but have we nothing better to do?

The answer is, that there are many important works waiting to be done which require collaboration. Often they are too large for one man or even for one university, but they are not too large or too requiring in time and labor for American scholarship. Are we aware of our numbers and resources? . . .

I am far from suggesting that all large undertakings should be under the direction of this Association. . . In many cases it will be the function of our executive not to direct but to supply the preliminary information and counsel, and to facilitate the exchange

of opinion on large proposals of research. In other cases, the undertaking can be carried on only by means of our joint cooperation with European scholars, and then the services of our executive will vary to fit the task. . . With a more effective organization we might do much more to encourage quality as well as quantity in research. If the editor of our *Publications*, for example, were given the means to select only the best that is attainable and to pay a moderate price for such contributions, that journal might be made representative of the best of our research and indispensable to every student. . .

I have asked you to note that students make up a larger portion of our public than ever before. Research enlists an army bearing the banners of a thousand different kinds of specialists. Not only education and literature, but scholarship itself is becoming democratized. It is no longer limited to the very few; it is becoming the possession in no small measure of the many. It is applied not merely to mathematics and the cultures of antiquity, but to almost every human interest and creation. It is no longer confined to the monasteries; it cannot be contained in the universities alone; its ideals and methods may inspire the ambition of any American youth. This expansion in the fields of scholarship and the great increase in the number of its devotees compel a new taking account of its public relations and services.

It may even be surmised that publicity is being forced upon us by the public itself. This fancy will at first seem extravagant hyperbole to some of us who have observed what faint and indiscernible ripples our best-considered efforts have made upon that vast and restless ocean—the American public. But have we not within the past few years also observed that ocean swelling in a great tidal wave, demanding self-improvement, education, knowledge, fairly inundating our publishing houses and universities? Much of this demand may be trivial and uncritical, but has it no virtue, no excellence? If one million persons this year are reading biographies, however silly and flashy, is it not certain that some few thousands of them will desire biography that is thorough and honest and scholarly? If we are paying enormous sums for correspondence courses that advertise to teach French in a few lessons, is not that a sign of a more ardent interest in the French language than we have always been able to evoke in our pupils? Is not the fact that we have more excellent candidates for the Ph.D. degree than ever before to be correlated with the facts that we have more graduate students of all sorts than

ever before, more people buying books, reading magazines, thronging our high schools, our extension courses, our correspondence schools. We teachers complain, as always, that we have too many poor students, but is it not true that in almost every branch of learning there are more capable students than ever before?

This public demand, it must be noted, is in a surprising measure for bookish knowledge, for a literary culture, an instruction in the humanities. The natural sciences, the applied sciences, and those modern sciences that have made their way into the field once reserved to the humanities—psychology, sociology, anthropology—all these, one after another, seem by some new advance to capture the public attention; and it is often said, perhaps with truth, that Americans as a whole are more interested in mechanical invention than in anything else. Nevertheless, there is no cessation in the interest in literature. English is the largest department in every college. Every nook and corner in the literature of our tongue is ransacked by pious students. We have all kinds of periodicals about books, and some of those dealing with current *belles lettres* penetrate every home along with the farm journals and story papers. Is it possible for all this interest in books to exist without a growing attention being paid to the processes of literary art, to the workings of the imagination, to the history and the future significance of this perennial occupation of mankind—without, in short, a demand for a capable and growing literary scholarship?

We talk of the mad race for wealth in which Americans are supposed to be fierce competitors, but those of us who are familiar with our great universities may wonder whether it is any more eager, more intense, more sacrificing of other interests, more engrossing than the struggle for knowledge and scholarship. It lies outside of my present purpose to attempt any analysis or rationalization of this *furor scholasticus*; but I may express my belief, that though peculiarly manifest at the present time, it is an inevitable and permanent accompaniment of the age-long democratic movement. In this period of unexampled prosperity, the people of our democracy are grasping for whatever has hitherto seemed beyond their reach for wealth, luxury, knowledge, culture, refinement, art, beauty. Whatever has in the past seemed the desideratum for a few, becomes the object of the desires of the many. The priceless joys of research cannot longer be hid from them. Democracy, if it is to succeed, cannot rest satisfied with a wide distribution of wealth, pleasure, comfort, and

security; scholarship is one of the higher things that it will demand and support.

ASHLEY HORACE THORNDIKE, Columbia University

THE FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY.<sup>1</sup>—Odd as it may seem after so many centuries of effort, the whole business of education is still in the experimental stage. If it were not so, if we had agreed upon our ideals, if we had all come to one and the same decision as to the purpose of education and the goal which we should endeavor to reach, that boy of whom I spoke a moment ago would at the age of five be showing an almost uncanny degree of alertness and observation, would be chattering Latin at ten, playing with the higher mathematics at fifteen, would finish college at nineteen, a cultured young gentleman whose knowledge of and interest in the literature and art of the world would be equaled only by his command of the intricacies of economics and political science, and who in taking his Ph.D. at twenty-two or twenty-three would have attained the dizzy height of a superman to whom the profoundest financial, industrial, legal, or political problems would be the merest bagatelle. Nothing of the kind is happening at present. . .

But this is not criticism of modern educational methods, nor am I pessimistic or discouraged about the outlook. I am simply describing to you actual conditions. It is only when we know how things really are that we can hope to remedy them. This is an era of reconstruction. The system we have is an aggregate consisting of traditional theories of education, on the one hand, and recently projected notions, on the other. In some cases we have retained the wrong traditions and have abandoned those that were indisputably sound; in other cases we have adopted some very doubtful modern theories and refused to give a hearing to others that have really great possibilities of success. But I believe that the worst is over. From this time on we may expect a fairly steady evolution. It will of course be slow. Remember that while education is a very old thing, the intensive scientific study of methods of education, of the fundamental principles of education is a matter of the last generation or two. Poor as the product still is, we have made and are making progress. We are climbing slowly up. But the educational climb is never a straight ascent. It is a spiral that from time to time flattens out (that is when one's educational opponents are in

<sup>1</sup> Address at the installation of M. Lyle Spencer as president of the University of Washington, February 22, 1928



command) and frequently dips down to inconceivable depths of pedagogical folly from which recovery is slow and tedious. . .

Such is the situation. What can we do to improve it? Into the problems of the elementary and secondary school I cannot go. Only indirectly do they pertain to my subject. We can leave them to the professors of education. I will only say in passing that I am one of those who appreciate highly the great contribution that the specialists in pedagogy have made to the lower schools. I have special pleasure in saying this because I have so often heard them unjustly assailed. . . But the papers that I have always objected to most strongly and listened to with the greatest impatience are these in which specialists in other fields have attacked the professors of education. For with very few exceptions the speakers have shown with the utmost clearness that they were not in touch with the latest theories of education and were hopelessly ignorant of what the educators were trying to do. . .

The very last paper of this kind that I heard—it was only a few months ago—was devoted to the excoriation of Ex-president Eliot, of Harvard University, and his accomplices in the great raid upon the sacred privileges of the humanities made some fifty years ago. I strongly suspect that the professor had written the address almost as long before, and being asked to fill a place in the program had rolled out his oldest barrel, and excavated the paper from its uttermost depths. . .

We may then leave primary and high-school education to these men. But what are we to do with the college and the university? . . .

Those who know only the colleges of the upper level little realize to what extent the term college is often abused. There are many colleges giving the bachelor's degree whose graduates have not attained the grade of efficiency represented by the lad of your sophomore year. Such institutions are nothing but sublimated high schools. The recitations held in them differ only from those in high schools in the fact that they are somewhat longer. The method is a combination of the old "lesson-learning" process of the secondary school and a lecture system under which students take careful notes of what the professors say and reproduce it faithfully at examination. There is a little information in it but no training. As a matter of fact it is often the very opposite of training; it is a brain-wrecking, mind-destroying thing. It is well adapted to the weakening of the intellect. . .

Even among the colleges of good standing—those that have risen far above the level just described—there is an uneasy feeling that all is not well. Experiments are going on all over the country. In the days of his presidency at Amherst Mr. Meiklejohn introduced some methods of instruction calculated to lead students away from the old method of learning by rote and make them think for themselves. . . It is certainly an interesting experiment. Everyone interested in college education is watching it.

At Dartmouth—a college that under President Hopkins is developing steadily increasing power—the curriculum was revised a few years ago. Here again the effort made was in the direction of abandoning the lesson-learning process and of devising a method that would make a student, instead of merely repeating what his professor told him, or memorizing the contents of his textbook, learn to do constructive work. . .

A notable change has been made at Harvard within the last few years. They have established there a tutorial system and instituted comprehensive examinations—examinations not on courses but on subjects—a plan that everybody says is working wonders. They even say that it has made the Harvard men interested in their studies. They are said not only to work hard during term time but even, of their own volition, to pursue their academic activities during vacation. . . An accumulation of credits will no longer win a bachelor's degree at Harvard. Every candidate must prove that he knows something about his subject. . .

In all the plans there are some good features; they are all highly laudable in that they are attempting to introduce constructive work into the undergraduate curriculum. That they make for improvement cannot be doubted; but that they do not reach the heart of the difficulty is equally apparent. The only solution of the problem lies in reorganization, and why more universities don't undertake reorganization is one of the mysteries of modern education. For the method of reorganization that should be adopted seems obvious. It consists in the frank recognition of the soundness of the theory that has resulted in the foundation of so many junior colleges, especially in the western states. The old four-year college is a failure; it is a relic of the past; it is cumbering the field of education; it belongs to the archeology of pedagogy; it should be appropriately classified, neatly labeled, and put away in a museum. The four years of the present organization do not form a unit. They consist

of two stages: that of the freshman and sophomore years, on the one hand, and that of the junior and senior years, on the other. In the former we have the now familiar institution of the junior college; in the latter we have the initial years of the university in the strict sense of the term. There is a distinct line of cleavage between the two. The years of the junior college constitute the proper period for the completion of a student's general education. They are in large part a continuation of the secondary school process. While it is desirable that some mild degree of specialization should begin in theory—for a student should be encouraged to follow a bent as soon as real signs of it are seen—yet the chief emphasis should undoubtedly be laid on bringing to some sort of symmetrical finality the essentials of a general education. Ideally the junior college should be a residence college and it should not be on the same campus as the university proper. Moreover, it should have its own special faculty—collegiate as opposed to university professors. And by collegiate professors I do not mean men who have failed in the higher work, but younger men who are coming on, who have demonstrated the quality of their scholarship, who have shown promise of originality, but whose chief activity shall be the training of junior college students. In cases where the junior college would be connected with a university and situated somewhere near it there would be no objection to a plan under which such instructors would give at least one course in the senior college or the graduate school—just by way of keeping their research souls alive—but their dominant interest would lie in the lower school. With such an instructional staff in the junior college we should soon be getting in the senior college, which is the beginning of the university, students really capable of beginning advanced work. Furthermore, a comprehensive examination—not on courses but on subjects—should be given at the end of the junior college and no one should be admitted to the higher level unless he proved himself worthy of it. This would be the point of departure for all those who have come to college for other rather than scholastic reasons. This sifting would be of distinct advantage to those who departed, of ineffable benefit to those who remained, and would materially reduce the enormous waste in time, effort, and money that is going on now in almost every higher educational institution in America.

Once in the senior college the students would carry on their work without any of that lesson-learning routine from which they would

already have been weaned in the junior college. Further, just as in the junior college, so to a far greater extent in the senior college the number of formal courses should be reduced. . .

Every professor here today who has in his classes recent graduates from the colleges in any part of the country knows as well as I how poor the results of the present collegiate system are. He knows that these bachelors of arts or science in an infinite number of cases have little information and what is far more serious are wholly lacking in that trained attitude of mind that is essential to real accomplishment in original or investigative work. Why should they have trained minds? They have never been taught to do constructive work. Whatever initiative or originality they may have had has been lectured out of them by our wonderful system. In advocating fewer courses I am not advocating a less comprehensive program of studies. But I would have the students do more of it by themselves. . . The technique that is demonstrated by a professor in one field can be transferred by any intelligent student to any other field within the same category of thought. And the final test is always the examination on the subject.

The graduate school is the apex of our university system. Like the college it has its problems. Some of these I have already incidentally mentioned, as, for example, the difficulties caused by the poor equipment of so many of the college alumni who become candidates for the master's or the doctor's degree. But there are still other weaknesses. One of the most serious of these is the interlocked graduate and undergraduate course. This is a course which, yielding credit as it does to both graduate and undergraduate students, joins college and graduate school in a union that is injurious to both. In these courses sometimes graduates and sometimes undergraduates are in the majority, but so far as my experience and observation go, the proportion does not materially affect the character of the work. So long as the two elements are there it is almost inevitable that the course, even though it yields graduate credit, will be nothing but an advanced collegiate course, and in any true evaluation of courses, under any system of even reasonable discrimination between what is graduate and what is undergraduate work, no graduate credit whatever should be given for it. . .

This brings me to another phase of these mixed courses, namely, the small amount of constructive work done in them by the students. A recent critic has made the remark that one of the troubles with our

educational system is that in the high school we continue the method of the elementary school; in the college we still cling to the methods of the high school; and in the university to those of the college. The criticism is not entirely true, but there is some truth in it. . . .

And as most college courses are of the old recitation type, so these mixed courses, conforming as they do to college standards, are woefully deficient in that which is the essential feature of graduate study, namely independent constructive work. What after all is a graduate course? Is it merely a course to which students are admitted for graduate credit? I prefer to accept the definition, given by one of the delegates, to the meeting of the Association of American Universities a year ago. He defined a graduate course as one in which instructor and students cooperate in an attempt to find the solution of some hitherto unexplored problem. This is certainly the highest kind of graduate course, and the only other kinds of courses that really deserve to be included in any rigidly organized graduate discipline are those devoted to the technical mastery of those phases of the subject without a knowledge of which that original research of which I spoke cannot be efficiently carried on. . . .

The graduate school then needs to be purged of undergraduate methods. But we should not stop there. We should build up the research side of the work. And to the seminars and problem courses to which I have already referred we should add something else, namely, the research institute. You are all familiar with this type of organization from your knowledge of such foundations as the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York, the Brookings School of Economics, and others. But these are not connected with any university. What I am suggesting is the organization of research institutes within a university. There is no better place for them. They would not displace the seminars. They would merely carry the principle of the seminar farther. In such a research institute the director, relieved for the most part of the duty of conducting formal classes, would cooperate with a small group of research associates and advanced graduate students in carrying to completion some important research project. These institutes may be in literature, in social science, or in pure science. The method is applicable to every subject. In one university that I know this plan is being tried and is meeting with great success. In no other way, I am convinced, can research work of such scale and quality be done. . . .

And to sum it all up the ideal university is one that, built upon a



foundation consisting of scientifically organized elementary and secondary school and junior college, begins to function in the senior college with the increased emphasis on independent work that should characterize that stage of the curriculum, but finds its full development only in the seminars, problem courses, and research institutes of the graduate or professional schools.

GORDON J. LAING, University of Chicago

ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF STATE UNIVERSITIES.<sup>1</sup>—*Province of Governing Boards.*—It is clear, of course, that the board should always retain and exercise legislative control of general policies. What is equally important is that the board should recognize that the work of a university is of a highly technical and professional character, and that legislation as to conduct of these activities must of necessity be entrusted to the general faculty or some substitute therefor, such as a council of deans or a university senate, in so far as the university as a whole is concerned, and to the various college faculties in so far as the interest of that college alone is affected. The establishment of standards of admission, of scholarship, and of graduation, the regulation of student conduct and scores of other items may well be subjects of board discussion only in their judicial capacity, and then only on complaint that in specific instances justice has not been done in accordance with the established regulations.

On the executive side the board should delegate all of its authority, reserving only the right to change the individuals to whom that authority is delegated whenever they have been shown to be incompetent. This action is necessary because satisfactory administration is not possible with overlapping authority. Standards of discipline cannot be maintained by presidents or deans if students whose fathers are influential and persistent can secure from the board exemption from penalties applied for delinquencies to students whose parents are less influential or less persistent. A fair and uniform administration requires that executive authority be exercised on one standard—not on two—and unless the board can give the time to administer all cases, it should not sort out a few for special consideration. Any board member will save himself and the university a great deal of trouble if he will promptly and definitely explain, even to his best personal friend, that it is not the business of the board, much less of the individual members of the board, to secure special

<sup>1</sup> Notes from Proceedings of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities, November, 1927

exemption for any one from a regulation deemed necessary for the maintenance of proper standards of conduct or scholarship.

A hundred illustrations might be given, but I will add only one, and that one is of the greatest importance. A university ceases to be worth public support the minute it fails to secure the best teachers available for the compensation that is possible. A university must have men of the highest scholarship and the best technical and professional training, who must be brought from wherever they may be found. No consideration of personal friendship, political affiliation, church relationships, fraternal membership, or state pride, either on the part of the nominating authority, which is usually the president, after conference with deans and department heads, or on the part of the approving authority, which is the board, should ever be allowed to enter into questions of appointment.

Since the finding of suitably prepared men is a long and difficult process, the board as individuals should not concern itself with appointments, and as a board should restrict itself solely to approving or disapproving the nominations made. Never should it substitute a candidate of its own. Even in the selection of a president, it may well advise with and consider carefully the advice of leading members of the university itself.

In its judicial function, the board should hold itself to be in the relation of a supreme court. Below it there should be points of final jurisdiction for minor matters. For example, the faculty committee on physical education may well render final decision on the application of a student to be excused from that course. In many things the various faculty committees may well be final. Others, the dean should decide. Many such decisions must be made by the president. Only those of major importance should come to the attention of the board, and none of these should come before the board on the personal presentation of any members thereof, but on due appeal and through the regular channels, the last of which should always be the president's office—not that the president should prevent any dissatisfied student, faculty member, or employee from reaching the board, but, first, he should have a chance to remove the dissatisfaction if possible and, second, he should be informed as to what matters are to come before the board in order that the whole case may be fairly presented. . .

It should be remembered that the great function of the board is to keep the university in harmonious cooperation with the general

public that supports it. Like all specialists, university professors and university administrators tend to get into ruts. They begin to think of their departments or their college as an independent little kingdom all their own, with which no one has either sufficient knowledge or justifiable right to interfere. They are likely to forget that the public will not continue to be interested in that which they do not understand, nor to vote taxes to be spent without public control. On account of the highly specialized and technical work of a university, this supervision and control cannot be exercised by the usual political machinery. The experience of a century has demonstrated that the present system of governing boards provides the control that is desirable and at the same time the degree of autonomy that is necessary.

It is this very independence of governing boards which has left them free to work out the destinies of state universities, unhampered by direct or detailed partisan and political control, that accounts for the present efficient service rendered by these institutions. At the present moment there is no graver danger facing state educational institutions than the efforts now being made in many states to transfer actual control from governing boards as now constituted, to some elected or appointed board or individual directly connected with the political machinery at the state Capitol. This effort is all the more dangerous because it makes its appeal to the public in the name of economy and efficiency which everybody desires and gives face to its arguments with specific cases of waste and extravagance in other departments of state administration. The danger is not that the available funds will be decreased, but that their expenditure will be directed by persons less qualified to determine the proper activities of a university than is now the case. . .

Neither should any member of the board become the special advocate of promotion or salary increase for individual faculty members. It may be true that Assistant Professor X is brilliant, capable, and popular, that he finds it difficult to support his family on his meagre salary, and that he ought to be promoted. If he is encouraged by his friend on the board to expect that promotion, difficulty is sure to arise. If the promotion is not made because the president points out that there are a dozen other assistant professors and two dozen teachers of other ranks, equally deserving of promotion that cannot be made without creating a deficit, Assistant Professor X very likely will blame the president. If on the other hand the promotion

is made, three dozen deserving teachers and perhaps twice as many less deserving ones will feel that personal influence with individual board members is of greater weight than meritorious service. There will arise in the faculty a lack of confidence in the fairness and impartiality of the administration, with the result that some of them will set about finding positions where fairer conditions prevail, and others will seek means to develop personal friendship with board members for private advantage.

Nothing is more essential to a university than faculty morale. Under any circumstances it is established with difficulty and may be destroyed with ease. A single instance of personal favoritism either by the president or board will produce a lack of confidence that it may take years to reestablish. No matter how wise or how able a member may be, he ceases to be a desirable member of the board if he attempts to use his position for his own advantage or to the advantage of his personal or political friends. This does not mean that he shall not be interested in the promotion of Assistant Professor X, because it is clearly in the interest of the university and the public that capable teachers shall have a salary sufficient to enable the university to retain them. It means rather that he shall be equally interested in all other deserving cases and that he shall promptly and definitely make clear to Assistant Professor X that the board member is a judge and not an advocate. His business is to see that the recommendations of the president are free from personal bias and that both president and board treat everyone alike.

S. D. BROOKS, University of Missouri

*Quality of Teaching.*—I think I indicated that there were three factors that should be considered in discussing the present situation in university administration. The first was that the poorest teaching to be found in any educational group is in universities. University teaching is much poorer than high school teaching or elementary school teaching or kindergarten teaching. Of course, there are good teachers in universities today, relatively, however, fewer than forty years ago. The second factor in the present situation is that there has been a very large increase in attendance upon institutions of higher learning and that has produced the third factor which I named, a continually increasing complaint or questioning as to the mounting costs, which situation the members of governing boards must necessarily face.

I gave as a reason in my judgment for the fact that our teaching had grown continually poorer the fact that there had been an undue stressing and emphasis placed upon two of the three university functions. The primary function in a university should be teaching, a second function is research, and the third function is administration. In the last twenty years there has been such a rapid advancement of the two latter functions that the stress has been placed there, with regard to the relative values of members of the staff, to the discouragement of the teacher as such.

I made the statement, which I have made in a great many places, that during the last ten years I did not believe that there had been a request made for an increased salary in any university where the increase was asked for on the basis of teaching ability exclusively, but, rather, that the increase has always been coupled with reference to the research work that the individual was doing or to the administrative work that the individual was doing as those are the reasons that are seemingly found to be successful ways of getting individual increases in salary—special cases I am speaking of, not schedule raises. Salary schedules have been raised due to the increased cost of living, but when the president has come to the board and asked that Professor Doe's salary be increased, just think back to the cases wherein he has given as a reason that he is a great teacher and we cannot afford to lose him by reason of his teaching ability as compared with the number of times in which the reason has been that he is doing a very valuable piece of research work, that he has written a book which has been introduced into a large number of schools, that he has developed into a fine convention speaker, or that from an administrative standpoint he is extremely valuable.

D. W. SPRINGER

**CURRICULAR GAPS.**—Our high schools and colleges as now administered are leaving large gaps in the education actually received by the students. This matter was first impressed upon my attention while teaching classes in psychology a number of years ago. When taking up the nervous system it was manifest that large fractions of the classes knew nothing about the cell and its structure and properties. When I asked how many had never had a course in zoology or biology, from a third to a half raised their hands. Later, when taking up sensation, about an equal fraction confessed to never having had a course in physics. They therefore knew little about the



physical aspects of light and sound, the stimuli in vision and hearing. Obviously this interfered with their mastery of certain portions of psychology.

Later, when taking up the curriculum in my classes in education, I began to collect data on the subjects that students had missed in both high school and college, and also on the subjects that they had somewhat wastefully repeated. . .

In the natural sciences, considered singly, the omissions vary from twenty-three per cent for botany in the West to sixty per cent for zoology in the East. With the East and West combined, the variation ranges from thirty-two per cent for chemistry to fifty-nine per cent for zoology. The percentages of omission run consistently somewhat lower for the West than for the East. This is probably accounted for by the fact that about thirty-five per cent of my students in the West were men, while only about eight per cent in the East were men. Women are somewhat less inclined to elect science than men. . .

But the variations between the East and the West, while interesting, are of secondary importance. As a whole the pictures presented are much alike. The primary question is, do these pictures present a wholesome state of American education? The truth is we have no accepted or inductively determined standard by which to judge their wholesomeness. Viewed from the standpoint of recognizing individual differences, one might argue that the tables show just about the omissions that one has the right to expect, but viewed from the standpoint of the social usefulness of knowledge the pictures seem quite unsatisfactory.

Let us remember that the students here concerned are already, or are soon to be, college graduates. They are soon to occupy leading positions in teaching, law, politics, business, and the home. Are these students equipped to touch life intelligently on all sides when nearly every one of them has omitted the study of some fundamental aspect of his esthetic, social, or physical environment? Music and art occupy a dynamic place in the lives of all cultured people, yet our high schools and colleges together fail to acquaint two-thirds of their students with these subjects. Physics elucidates the harnessed forces back of our industrial life and our conveniences, yet it is missed by more than one-third. Biological science yields indispensable principles for the appreciation and intelligent regulation of personal and social life, yet it is omitted by many.

Over against these omissions there are duplications of introductory

courses that range from five per cent in zoology to forty-two per cent in American history. This means that many students had essentially the same subject in both high school and college. In view of the fact that these students had not yet had any work in certain other equally fundamental subjects, the duplications are hard to justify.

These omissions and duplications are the direct result of the lack of an educational system in this country. . .

To bring about a better state of affairs several things are necessary, no doubt, but only two of them appear to be primary. These are, first, that all teachers, especially those above the primary grades, learn to see education as a whole; and, second, that the provisions for those who are going through to the end of liberal education and for those who are aiming to branch out into vocational life along the way must be differentiated more definitely; that is, we must differentiate between through passengers and those who get off at local stations. The bugbear of democracy need not frighten us. If it is best for the individuals concerned, it is best also for democracy. . .

In order to achieve a meaningful, coherent, and unfolding curriculum it is fundamental to distinguish between the successive cycles of instruction in the same subject. In physics, in botany, in history, and every other subject we may recognize an introductory cycle and we may recognize higher cycles. Each cycle has, or should have, its own distinct and definable angle of approach, and it should assume that the pupil comes prepared with the equipment of the preceding cycle or cycles. This is a problem that is in need of both wider recognition and experimental determination. In its solution the cooperation of workers in adjacent cycles is indispensable.

In the introductory cycle breadth rather than depth should be the primary consideration. The pupil should receive an introduction to all the basal subjects, concretely considered in their relation to life. After having passed through this cycle he should come out with no gaps such as are manifest in table I.

Suppose the reader had a clean slate in respect to the curriculum beyond the first six grades of the elementary school. Suppose further that he could forget all about our junior high school, senior high school, junior college, and senior college divisions. What would be set down as the minimum cultural education for all, thinking primarily of those who have the ability and inclination to go through to the next cycle?

In response to this question one of my classes in education compromised on the following list:

English	4 units
Mathematics	3 units
Natural science	3 units
History and government	3 units
Geography, commerce, industry, etc.	3 units
Manual arts or home economics	2 units
Art appreciation	1 unit
Musical appreciation	1 unit
Physical training	2 units
Electives	8 units
Total	30 units

The complete list of subjects given amounts to 30 units. As some of the subjects could be presented with little outside preparation, a pupil should be able to complete five units a year. This would require six years for the completion of the cycle. As it was assumed that this work would start with the seventh grade, the allotment of six years to it corresponds to the present time span of the junior and senior high schools. It might therefore be called the high-school cycle, although there is nothing sacred about the figure six. . .

One of the fundamental aims of the introductory cycle of cultural education is, and should be, breadth. This has been our guiding aim so far. But a rounded education requires depth as well as breadth. In a small measure this has already been provided for through electives, but it is in the next or college cycle that depth of education assumes a primary position. It is in this cycle that specialization should be the dominant note. Students should now begin to lay their foundations for later professional study. They should branch off into pre-medical, pre-legal, pre-engineering, pre-teaching, and other more or less specialized curricula. . .

The time to be devoted to the various curricula in the collegiate cycle should ideally be determined conjointly by educationists and by the educators connected with the various professions. We are now usually giving two years to pre-medical and to pre-legal curricula, but if all the ends that I have enumerated are to be measurably attained, at least three years of time would be needed. At the end of this time a bachelor's degree would logically be conferred.

The next or university cycle in this scheme of educational organization would consist essentially of a group of professional schools. In this group the graduate school would occupy a central and coordi-

nating position. Research is germane to every field of endeavor and it is through the graduate school that this work should be stimulated and directed. No line need be drawn between pure science and applied science investigations. This line is clear enough logically, but to compel the research worker to become conscious of it is to raise a needless obstacle.

I am ready to admit that the scheme of education that I have outlined is Utopian. We are far from having attained it, yet it seems to me that the trends in our present educational reorganization are moving definitely in this direction. The junior high school is now dominated by the spirit of the introductory cycle of cultural education and needs only to encompass and to leaven the lump of the entire high-school cycle. The junior college may similarly take over the functions of the collegiate cycle and the senior college may be absorbed by the graduate and professional schools.

Owing to the many social ramifications and the forces of tradition, educational reorganization is always slow. The process is, and should be, evolutionary rather than revolutionary. Nevertheless, in social affairs, to which education belongs, an enlightened conception of the end to be attained may not only keep the evolutionary process in the proper channel but it may also quicken its pace.

W. C. RUEDIGER, George Washington University,  
*School and Society*, vol. xxvii, no. 688

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA.<sup>1</sup>—During the course of the year the question of further limitation in the Lower Division has been widely discussed among all elements of Stanford University. The increase in population and in wealth and the growth of the public school system have brought this whole question forward with unusual force. The following statement regarding this question was made at the request of the Board of Trustees by the President to the Stanford National Board.

Some years ago Stanford limited the number of students accepted for the two elementary years and set up the Lower Division with a definite program of instruction. This was necessary in order to keep the number of students in the University in proper proportion to its endowment funds.

There has been a steady increase in the facilities provided by the public school system, particularly here in California, so that with

<sup>1</sup> Report of the President of Stanford University, 1926-27

the development of the junior colleges we are having an increasing number of students applying for admission with the beginning of the so-called junior year. We are reaching the stage where there is no longer a necessity for continuing to any great extent instruction which is given extensively as part of the public school system.

The forces that are bringing this about are in evidence all over the United States, but particularly so in California, where the rapidly expanding population and the great advance in the high school population together with the sound economic condition of the state have made the problem acute. For instance we now have junior college facilities available in more than thirty places in California.

At the present time, except for the junior college in Los Angeles, lower division or junior college facilities are being provided for Los Angeles, Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, and San Francisco by the University of Southern California, the two branches of the University of California, and by Stanford University. Such an abnormal condition of affairs is not apt to continue indefinitely.

There is no good reason why endowment funds given for a "university of high degree" should be used to subsidize elementary instruction given in many places in the state when there is such a constant demand for more funds for the assistance of those students who desire adequate university training for the professions and for research. Looking ahead a very short time we can see that we shall have available junior college facilities at one edge of our campus provided by a county district and supported by the taxpayer and at the other side a private junior college for those able and willing to pay the tuition.

In order to meet the situation, to protect the Stanford endowment, to keep the prestige of the University, and to maintain a position of leadership in education I am recommending to the Board of Trustees that, beginning with the academic year 1928-29, further limitations be made in the number of students accepted in the Lower Division in proportion to the number of applicants received from junior college students. It seems probable at the present rate of increase in the number of junior college students that by the time the present preferences cease, January 1, 1934, our Lower Division will practically be absorbed by other institutions.

The following points, while not covering all of the suggestions or conditions or criticisms that are naturally made by those who fear the results of a change, are of interest:



1. The extension of the high-school period by two years is in keeping with the European experience. We admit to Stanford now the graduates of German gymnasia, of French lycées, or of English secondary schools with junior standing.

2. That type of student who is fitted for university work is maturing under the changes that have taken place in our public school system so that he is ready for college at fifteen and sixteen years of age. With the development of junior colleges these students will come to Stanford at approximately the same age as they have come in the past but they will be entering the junior year. They will then remain at the University three to five years if they are to become teachers; six years for physicians; four years for engineers; four years for business administration; five to six years for lawyers; and a varying period of from two to six years for those who seek a general training or wish to go into research, scholarship, or some of the other fields of activity. This means that there will be an average longer campus residence for students than at present and that such activities, as athletics, fraternities, dramatics, etc., can be conducted on a better basis than at present. This means also that there will necessarily be some change in the one-year dormitory rule, some readjustment in the eligibility for athletics of students possessing the Bachelor of Arts degree, etc. It is probable that we can maintain a student body of approximately the same size as at present.

3. It is important to note that there are now eight public junior colleges in Kansas, fifteen or twenty in Texas, a considerable number in Missouri, and that the movement to extend the high school work for two years is starting in Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Missouri, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. Oregon is discussing a bill providing for fourteen junior colleges in that state. There are twenty-five private junior colleges in the United States at the present time, and only eleven of the forty-eight states in which no junior colleges are found.

4. The quality of instruction in the junior college is at least equal to that given in the university. The things required for this period of instruction are good teaching, small classes, library facilities, and moderate laboratory facilities. These can be provided at a minimum of expense.

5. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in California has announced that the development is an inevitable one. The state Legislature is apt to come forward soon insisting that San

Francisco, Berkeley, and Los Angeles meet their junior college responsibilities just as have Fresno, San José, Sacramento, San Diego, and the other cities in California.

This is Stanford's opportunity to obtain national and international prestige as a university. It is organized on such a basis that it can take leadership and initiative and does not have to wait upon political expediency or be driven by force of circumstances to reluctantly adopt a forward-looking educational program. . .

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on June 23, 1927, the following resolution was passed:

*Resolved*, That the Board of Trustees approve the recommendation of the President of the University there be a further reduction in the number of students to be admitted to the Lower Division at the University, and that the President be authorized to carry out this policy, at such rate and to such extent as may, from time to time, be authorized by this Board, and that no determination be made at this time of the question of the elimination of the Lower Division at any specific period.

This means that Stanford University is now on its way to further development of its Upper Division and graduate work as its responsibilities for Lower Division work are reduced.

RAY LYMAN WILBUR, Stanford University

A NEW TYPE OF COLLEGE.—The American college, which is the child of the English college, has derived its ideals from the university instead of adapting itself to the actual needs of the students of college age. Our American civilization is so varied that there will always be a place in it for colleges of such heredity; but among our educational facilities there must also be colleges of other types, fashioned to meet quite different and diverse requirements. . .

Especially must the modern American college retrace its path a bit and pick up a thread lost when scientific interest, by its very success in important directions, absorbed the attention of makers of the curriculum. What can a college of liberal *arts* accomplish? This does not mean a surrendering or a neglect of the scientific and the rational necessary as tools and as sign-posts. But, in due proportion, keener powers of appreciation must be developed and canons of good taste, more uniform and of indisputable authority, must be set up. It is senseless to cry out that taste is an individual matter and cannot be made to conform to a predetermined pattern. We

have seen the impress of bad taste repeatedly in modern society. We know the foundations of it are laid in a desire for excitement and an instinctive recognition of the lurid and striking. These are *primitive* characteristics; to blame those who find pleasure in them is unscientific. The facts should be taken rather as symptomatic of the disease in education—an atrophy of the powers of appreciation—due to the neglect of colleges which subordinate a craving for beauty to the public interest in such research as is paid for by material success.

As a matter of fact, training in appreciation is much more suitable to the age of the college student than is the emphasis on ratiocination. It is well-proved fact that genius, when it burns at all, burns young; that if it is not given opportunity, it chokes and never burns at all. Reasonableness, on the other hand, is a product of experience and comes with age. The order which we have tried to impose on our college youth is the reverse of natural. . . Much earlier in the education of our youth we must begin to stress beauty, to define harmony, to teach that evil in all its forms is unbeautiful and can best be recognized from this angle. The failure of the colleges to recognize this need is not wholly theirs, but is due in part to the fault of the age—the mania for speed. Science and speed are synonymous; the rapidity with which ions travel, the ways in which distance is eliminated, the conquests over time itself, have placed a premium on speed. Appreciation, the art of living beautifully, an understanding of the underlying significance of the “facts” of life, require leisure, and this we have not. . .

The modern college must align its interests, must return to a more leisurely and considered regimen if “higher education” is not to dash itself to pieces. Such a simplification of interests cannot take place within the single college; it is to be brought about by diversifying the types of college broadly. Let the old and established colleges abide by their time-honored task, and let them select their students wisely and well, continuing to refuse to yield an iota to the claims of those who have students to present “worth higher education,” but who cannot justify their claim to such education in the time-honored way. But let such new funds as may be available go to the founding of new colleges of different types and for new purposes, rather than to the swelling of the assets of colleges already too large and too complex for the business of a leisurely and orderly training of youth.

MARION COATS, Sarah Lawrence College,  
*What the Colleges Are Doing*, January, 1928

**THREE PLANS FOR PRESIDENTS.**—My experience as a student and teacher in the University of Michigan, together with such contact as I have had with other schools and colleges, leads me to say that, whatever else is needed, the following require specific and active attention on the part of college deans and presidents.

My proposals are these:

Have the college or university library secure the periodicals expressing the experimental fringe of society in art and politics. . .

Again, get for college audiences speakers representing rebellious, discontented, and non-conformist classes and groups. Alexander Meiklejohn alone, I believe, makes a systematic effort to bring before his students speakers on both sides of controversial questions. . .

Finally insist on complete equality of treatment of students of all races in the college or university, and furthermore stand back of them in the business places of the town. . .

In short, a college or university should be a clearing house and laboratory for ideas as well as a dispenser of traditional information and a training place for various types of salesmen.

OAKLEY JOHNSON, *The New Student*, vol. 7, no. 25

**PROFESSOR vs. PSYCHIATRIST.**—No one who has been in close touch with the academic world for any length of time can doubt the need of a measure, at least, of mental hygiene. The difficult adolescent years are a problem in any situation; they become especially complex at college because of the intellectual shake-up that accompanies them. No university worthy of the name fails to disturb habits of thought that date way back to a comfortable unskeptical childhood. And this not only in matters of religious import; a Copernican revolution in the whole sphere of thought dislocates things that will remain so dislocated for years. These trying experiences cause just the sort of trouble that a mental hygienist ought to be capable of handling. Why, then, the recalcitrance on the part of the academic profession, so different from the attitude of teachers of young children? Why are the most heroic measures resorted to before a professor is willing to refer a student to the psychiatrists in charge of the mental hygiene department?

The easy answer is that the time is not yet ripe; that the college professor has not become acquainted with the philosophy of mental hygiene. It is certainly true that the professor does not understand the implications of the new therapy; that he still thinks in an obso-

lete terminology. One suggests to one's colleagues that so-and-so might be referred to the psychiatrist at the medical school, and the reply is likely to be: "But my dear sir, it's not as bad as that. He's only a little depressed. He's not insane." Or the psychiatrist himself proposes a talk to a group of students, causing a raised eyebrow and the query, "About what? Masturbation?" The psychiatrist returns to his study to await the coming millennium when psychiatrists will be kings and college presidents psychiatrists.

That easy answer, unfortunately, presents only half the picture. If the psychiatrist can justly complain, so also can the professor. There are certain differences of attitude which may have virtues, but certainly have vices. By interest, training, and temperament these two professions look at life differently. The problem is not one of change or accommodation on the part of one group. For the professor to come entirely to the psychiatric point of view would be a major tragedy in our civilization. It would mean a surrendering of values that would make even the mental hygienist a poorer soul. The problem is one of mutual understanding. And when it comes to that, psychiatrists no less than professors are a stiff-necked and perverse people.

A consideration of the two backgrounds may help to explain the apparent irreconcilability. The writer is aware of the dangers of speaking of either profession as a group with a common philosophy, or a common technique. He is also aware that both groups contain charlatans as well as geniuses; he is finally aware that the professor or psychiatrist in referring to his enemy has the former in mind, while in thinking of his own group he has the latter. Nevertheless there seem to be some fundamental differences, which, if not necessary are at least usual. To one who has associated with both psychiatrist and professor these differences seem to be the basis of the antagonism.

The university professor has spent a good many years of his life learning the subject-matter and technique of research of his field. His interest may be in English literature, in economics, in psychology, physics or chemistry. If he is any good he is studying what is intrinsically interesting to him; he is studying it for no more practical end than the fun of it. That outside of that he may be practical; that his investments may be intelligent; that he may even exploit his intellectual love in the interests of his wife and family, no one will deny. But regardless of that the age of Pope, or radio-activity, or business cycles is important as a *Ding-an-sich*. It is important



in the intellectual history of mankind and should, therefore, be preserved even at the cost of some individual sacrifice.

Much of intellectual history has been made by queer people, epileptics, drunkards, dope-fiends, libertines. Never mind all that. Faust is worth all the women Goethe ruined; the Critique of Reason those Kant never loved; the Ode to a Grecian Urn, all of Keats' unhappiness; the Fifth Symphony, all the stormy impetuosity of Beethoven. The works are worthy regardless of the personality of the author. They can be studied and loved, as are the Iliad and the Odyssey by generations who know nothing of their creator or his personal, private idiosyncracies. They lose none of their value if they were first put out by fraud. Hamlet is the same Hamlet, whether written by a play actor or a scientist.

This attitude of the college professor is shared by his students, and most of the rest of the world. The earnest men in all departments of the university have it. Those in charge of the religious life of the students see religion in its spiritual and historical aspects. It is beautiful; it is old. What a pity that modern life is laying so much stress on the ugly and new. It is not only that students are less happy, but that some beauty is going out of the world because its only habitat, the human mind, rejects it. The pastor has, certainly, a definite interest in his students, but no less a one in his God and the ritual by which he expresses his mystical union with that God.

The physical and biological scientists often go further in their interest in research, and their lack of interest in their students. Many of them fight shy of the undergraduate, and ask nothing better than to be left alone with a few chosen spirits, to carry on their investigations. To all of these people education is real, it is vital both for its discoveries and for what it preserves. It carries on and develops the contribution that distinguishes man from the rest of the animal world.

The psychiatrist's viewpoint is entirely different. To him the person is of profound importance, and his work has chiefly a diagnostic or a therapeutic value. His evaluation is too often on the basis of what is revealed of the person behind the activity, rather than the activity itself. Religion is an outlet, art a compensation, science the expression of a dislocated libido. The college professor is nervous in his presence, because he fears that he will be translated rather than understood. His non-conforming attitudes are interpreted,

traced back to some personal idiosyncrasy. The English professor who chuckles too audibly at Restoration literature is, perhaps, finding relief for a repressed emotional or sexual life. The same is likely to be true of the biologist whose experiments are too closely connected with the functions of reproduction. And the scientist who reaches his laboratory hatless, tieless, at crack of dawn is obviously in need of treatment.

When it comes to the student, the situation becomes even more incomprehensible. The whole educative process is looked upon in terms of adjustment and therapeutics. The intrinsic importance of a course or an idea is slurred over, while its possible effect on the mental and emotional health of the student is given first place. A lad joins the Atheist Club, or the Liberal Club, or expressed great interest in companionate marriage, or Renaissance art, or fifth century Athens; he likes to be alone on occasion, and goes off for long walks in the country, and refuses to take a room mate; he is out of step here or there; the tendency, on the part of the psychiatrist, is to look at it as a manifestation of a disorder that needs studying. It may lead to mental ill-health. Not what the untrained professor would call insanity, but what he might think of untechnically as unhappiness or misfitness. The professor thinks of Shelley, and has a secret fondness for the boy. He is loth to see a return to health and normality. The psychiatrist thinks of the literary outpourings of his neurotic patient, and steps in to save him. It seems to be a real tussle, with no middle ground. Carlyle shouts fiercely, let him alone; no one ever passed a law compelling people to be happy. To which mental hygiene replies, hmm—dyspepsia!

One who has been interested in both points of view wonders a little at the unnecessary antagonism. Both the student and his work are important, and college education can afford to neglect neither. The psychiatrist is on the wrong track when he cheapens religion, art, and science by likening them to bicarbonate of soda, excellent though that be in its way. It is just as unfortunate for the professor to cheapen his students by considering them as mere vehicles for preserving and passing on his beloved subject. A comprehensive mental hygiene program is not different really from a comprehensive educational one. It is the habit of thinking in static, mutually exclusive concepts which makes the difficulty seem insurmountable.

DONALD SLESINGER, *The Survey*, vol. lix, no. 12

CLEVELAND COLLEGE: AN EXPERIMENT IN ADULT EDUCATION.—It must have put a considerable strain upon even the defiant optimism of President Vinson of Western Reserve when he proposed to President Howe of Case that a new affiliated down-town college primarily for adults, with classes mainly after work hours, be established without buildings, grounds, equipment, endowment, director, faculty, or even football team or stadium of its own in sight—none of the accepted *sine qua non* of collegiate success! . . .

Now, in its third year, Cleveland College has about thirty-two hundred students. About five hundred of these are graduates, coming from nearly a hundred colleges and universities, with such degrees as A.B., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., and M.D.; about a thousand more have had some previous college training; about twelve hundred have high-school diplomas only; and about four hundred have never completed a high-school course.

The range in age is from sixteen to seventy-one. The two oldest students are women. One is a bright seventy-one-year-old mother of a college professor and the other an able sixty-eight-year-old woman physician. However, a male bank vice-president of sixty-seven is pretty close behind. About five hundred of the students are below twenty-one, about sixteen hundred are between twenty and thirty and about a thousand are between thirty and seventy-one.

These students are of all social and financial strata. Sitting side by side are cab drivers, stenographers, clerks, managers, bank vice-presidents, Junior Leaguers, wives and children of millionaires, journalists, poets, artists, social workers, judges, politicians, and all sorts and conditions of men and women, the one common bond being a desire for some kind of knowledge and training, and the ability to work successfully at the college level. The numbers of men and women are practically equal.

Each student studies what he pleases, comes to class or not, studies the lessons or not, and takes the examination or not, just as the desire moves him. In spite of this, eighty-five per cent stay with their courses to the very end, and only four per cent of those taking the final examination fail. The average grade is distinctly above that of first-class day colleges. As yet, not a single case of disorder has arisen, not a rule has been made, or a discipline committee appointed. . .

About one hundred and fifty different courses are offered each term, only one of which is not of college grade. About half of these are vocational, such as business administration, engineering, indus-

trial chemistry, industrial psychology, journalism, library science, and parental education, and the other half cultural, such as art and musical appreciation, composition, literature, languages, history, and the biological, physical, and social sciences.

The degrees of A.B., B.B.A., and M.B.A. are granted by Cleveland College as one of the colleges of Western Reserve, and many courses are given that may count toward the M.A. or Ph.D. degrees in the graduate schools of Western Reserve and other universities that grant these degrees.

It is interesting to see that, with no pressure whatever, more than half the registrations are in cultural subjects. The twenty or more courses in literature and composition register several hundred more students than the twenty-odd courses in business administration. There are more students in history and the other social sciences than in all of the twenty courses in engineering. More are studying psychology or languages or biology than study home economics, journalism, or library science.

The faculty is quite remarkable for its variety. There are now ten full-time members of the Cleveland College faculty, with forty-nine part-time teachers from the Western Reserve University faculty, twenty-six from Case, twenty from the Cleveland School of Education and the staff of the Cleveland Public Schools, and one or more each from the Cleveland School of Art, the Child Guidance Clinic, the Nutrition Clinics, the Health Council, the Juvenile Court, the editorial staffs of the big dailies, the Cleveland Orchestra, the Playhouse, the Red Cross, and the scientific and educational staffs of some of the large manufacturing, financial, and mercantile institutions of Cleveland.

If there is any one thing that characterizes Cleveland College, besides the earnestness, fine character, variety, and ability of its student body, it is the rich variety and intimate contact with real life found in its faculty. It is this faculty, more than all else combined that accounts for the fact that this homeless college for adults, less than three years old, has five hundred more students than all four of the long-established day colleges of Cleveland combined.

Let us turn now from statistics to some of the problems that Cleveland College is attacking or planning to attack.

First of all, we are trying to work out new courses of study that meet the needs of adults better than do the conventional college courses—both general culture courses and vocational courses.

For the layman who seeks general culture in any field of human learning, the present college courses are nearly all too technical, too full of detail, too pre-professional. For example, if the intelligent layman wishes to learn in biology the large, important facts and the far-reaching general principles that apply to his problems, such as the principles of evolution, of growth of development, of nutrition, of heredity—what such men as Darwin, Lamarck, Weismann, DeVries, and Mendel really taught—he would usually first have to wade through long hours of classification of animals, dissections of earthworms and dogfish, practice in microscopic technology, and so forth. This is all needed by the specialist, but merely drives out of the class the layman.

Many able college professors have long recognized the need for such general culture courses for non-experts, and several plans for securing them have been tried. They have accomplished good results in the sciences at Chicago and in the social sciences in Columbia, by having several of the specialists in a large field combine in giving a brief general survey course for the whole field. But the fundamental difficulty arises out of the fact that the average college professor cannot get away from his technical details and his professional point of view, even when he tries to do so.

There are, however, scattered over the world two or three noted scholars in each of the great fields of human learning who have proven their ability to omit details, and to present in artistic, interesting form and in non-technical language the outstanding facts and principles in their fields that have general significance. I refer to such men as Doctor Slosson in the physical sciences, Vernon Kellogg and Julian Huxley in the biological sciences, Ross and Beard in the social sciences, and Harvey Robinson in history.

It is planned to bring to Cleveland to lecture once a week for a semester of sixteen weeks two such men each term, one in the sciences and one in the arts, until the following fields are covered: the physical sciences, the biological sciences, mathematics and astronomy, the social sciences, the mental sciences, the history of the human race, the history of our own race, the literature of the world, the literature of our own race, music, art, and architecture. Each course will be open to all approved adults.

One may merely attend the lectures, or may do additional work and count the courses toward a college degree, if he has the required college entrance credits. Each class will meet once a week for a period



of two hours, one and one-half hours being given to lecture and demonstration, and half an hour to questions and discussion. Each teacher is to prepare his lectures for publication as one of the volumes in *The Western Reserve Two-Foot Book-Shelf of General Surveys of Human Learning*. In this way Cleveland College and all other colleges will secure for future use a lively text and list of parallel readings that will help less talented teachers to give satisfactory general survey courses.

It requires an underwriting of fifty thousand dollars to carry out this plan. A liberal friend of education has pledged twenty-five thousand. If the other twenty-five thousand can be secured in time, these courses will be begun next fall.

In the meantime, we have one course surveying the physical sciences and another the biological sciences, given, with audible satisfaction on the part of the classes, by two able local scientists.

Another interesting and somewhat unusual group of classes in musical appreciation and in the history and technic of the stage has been established, in cooperation with the Cleveland Orchestra and the Cleveland Playhouse, or Little Theatre. A distinguished composer and teacher, the assistant conductor of the orchestra, gives the two music appreciation courses. In addition to illustrating his lectures on the piano, he brings before the class from lesson to lesson the leading player of each orchestral instrument. The construction of the instrument is explained, its range and emotion-arousing qualities demonstrated by selections played. The class also attends special night rehearsals of the Cleveland Orchestra to familiarize themselves better with the pieces to be played at the concerts, and to watch the process by which the conductor develops the performance of a great piece. The class is also sold season tickets to the twenty symphony concerts at an almost nominal price. Before each concert, the program is studied in class, and after the performance there are class reports and discussion. A similar relation with the staff of the Playhouse enables students not only to study stage technique from text, lecture, and lantern slide, but to see behind the scenes the processes of actually preparing on a commercial scale the stage properties and costumes, planning the scenes, training the company, handling the lighting, and so on.

Where such a rich concrete background, or laboratory, is wisely handled, the course is a vast improvement over the usual college course in the subject. Similar combinations that we hope to make

with the Art Museum, Natural History Museum, public-services agencies, and various business enterprises should greatly add to the vitality and value of college work. Undoubtedly, much careful study and experiment will be needed yet to work out just the best technique for handling such courses.

Cleveland College is also trying to develop some courses from the standpoint of specific adult needs, rather than the standpoint of a group of specialists, each interested primarily in the development of a certain academic field of learning and in the education of experts in this field. For example, there are millions of mothers and fathers having trouble with the tantrums of their children, with their nutrition or growth, with their education, or their emotional complexes. These parents cannot stop to get typical college courses in the psychology of the emotions, in psychoanalysis, in education, in nutrition, in biology, and in physiology and hygiene. Some aspects of all these subjects are involved in parents' problems, but most of the material in the standard college courses in these subjects is not necessary for parents' purposes or needs. We, therefore, induced a group of experts in these several specialties to comb out of the bewildering mass of details in each field just those facts and principles that the average intelligent non-expert can use. This material was organized into a series of courses, which are called Parental Education—courses that cut across academic subject lines and do violence to traditional academic ideas of thoroughness, but that give to parents usable knowledge on the college level of priceless value. There are ten such courses, meeting once a week for two hours for seventeen weeks. There is one course each dealing with the following subjects: cultivation of health habits, nutrition, art in the home, administration of a home, the pre-school child, the six-to-twelve-year-old child, the adolescent, family relations, fathers' problems, and training for leadership in parental education.

During the past year there were three hundred and seventy-one registrations in the Parental Education courses. Nearly all of these students were mothers. So far as my information goes, this is ten times as many parents as have ever before been induced to take a real college course dealing solely with the problems of parenthood for an entire semester.

This may not prove to be the best thing that can be done for parents but it represents a serious effort to aim courses at the solution of vital actual life problems of a group of students, rather than have

the character of the course determined by academic interests and the preconceptions of the faculty as to what students ought to want.

Finally, we have made a very modest effort at working out a method of teaching adults that will remedy at least in part some of the most serious defects in the usual college methods of teaching. As I see it, four of the unpardonable weaknesses of most college methods of teaching are:

1. No adequate provision is made for the great differences in capacity among the students. . .

2. The students are altogether too passive, merely receiving things. In effect, their attitude is: "Now educate me."

3. Students seem to have very little joy in their study and little tendency to continue the study on their own initiative after the course is finished. When college students finish a course they usually sell—or even burn—their books!

4. It is almost accidental, except in laboratory sciences, if a student learns what are poor and what are good methods of studying and forms good habits of study.

The past term we experimented in a psychology and in an English composition class with a method of teaching that was especially planned to allow each student to work at his full capacity, to stimulate the student to take a more active part in his own education, to teach better methods of study, and to awaken more pleasure in studying the subject.

In the psychology class, a method combining some features of the Dalton plan, the Burke-Winnetka individual-study plan, and the supervised study plan was substituted for the usual college lecture plan in one section. A check section was taught by the same teacher by the usual combination of lecture and so-called discussion.

The course was broken into definite units, each unit having a minimum essential and an additional optional part for those able to carry it. For each unit, a mimeographed study guide was given out, containing suggestions for study, references to pages in text and in parallel readings, and self-examining objective type quizzes and answers. The lesson period is two hours long. The first hour and a half is given to supervised study, self-examination, and conference with the teacher. The text and parallel readings are present in the classroom. The last half hour of the class period is devoted to discussion and application, led by the teacher. The teacher occasionally adds some new material not in text or references, but not a

single lecture was given after the first day. The class objected decidedly at first. They soon learned to study easily, but left the impression upon the instructor that they were not learning so rapidly as was the check class to which he was lecturing. In a final, very comprehensive, objective-type examination, however, the lectured class averaged sixty-eight, while the self-study class averaged ninety-two. The professor remarked that, at any rate, it was a consolation to know that his lectures set the class back only twenty-four per cent!

The average ability of the experimental section, as shown by mental tests, was about ten points higher than that of the lecture section, so that more experimentation is necessary before any conclusion can be drawn—except the conclusion that even able professors cannot tell how much their classes are learning, and are very likely to overestimate the results of their own lectures!

In the English composition class a somewhat different plan was followed that succeeded obviously in keeping students of all grades of ability working at their maximum. It also seemed to make students much more active, more interested in the subject and in their pursuit of it outside of the required class work, but it did not result in the notable increase in amount learned that the experiment in the psychology section seemed to show.

These are, of course, only preliminary efforts but the results already indicate clearly that better methods of teaching can and will be devised for these adult students. With far richer background of experience than youths can possibly have to which to relate and by which to interpret new ideas, with different motives of action and different needs to be met, it is absurd to teach adults by the same methods by which we teach children.

A. CASWELL ELLIS,

*Journal of the American Association of  
University Women, April, 1928*

A CONTACT OFFICER FOR PROSPECTIVE FRESHMEN.—An answer to the oft-asked question how to pilot the freshman past the rocks of first year failures is offered by Bart E. McCormick, secretary of the board of visitors of the University of Wisconsin. As a member of this accrediting board, Mr. McCormick studied the cases of five hundred Wisconsin students who withdrew or were dropped in their first year. His conclusion, based on the board's report of the investigation, throws favorable light on such recent plans as freshmen week

and orientation courses, devices intended to acquaint the entering student with all phases of college life, but it advises university authorities to go still further. Help the freshman before he leaves his hometown high school, is the message of the board, which advises the university to maintain a "contact officer" in the field, for the benefit of the prospective freshman.

"A few years back our high schools were accused of being college preparatory institutions, to the neglect of the majority of boys and girls of high school age in the community whose purposes were other than that of attending college. In recent years the pendulum has swung to the other extreme according to the opinion of some critics; and while college entrance courses are still maintained not so much attention has been given to directing the pupils of these courses as to directing those of the vocational type. The field for pre-registration advising and counseling of prospective college students appears, therefore, to invite further effort.

"The report suggested that pre-registration counseling might be accomplished through closer cooperation with secondary school authorities, through informational literature, through familiarizing high school students with entrance requirements, through explanation of the various courses and the selective process in colleges and universities, through acquainting prospective students with problems of the freshman year, explaining college traditions, and interpreting the college attitude to students and their parents.

"It is possible to carry out a part of this program by mail, but pre-registration advising and counseling, in the opinion of the board, could be made still more effective through a contact officer of the university who might spend a portion of his time in the field where he could function by visiting high schools, interpreting college entrance requirements and college demands to prospective students, their parents, teachers, and principals, and possibly advising students in the selection of courses.

"Perhaps the contact officer could spend the first few weeks of the college year on the campus where he could be of assistance to incoming students, who having made his acquaintance in their own environment might feel free to approach him for advice on their problems. At any rate his contact in the field should enable him to secure a mass of intimate information which could be brought back to the university and used by advisers in administering to the needs of freshmen students. His visits might encourage those who



were not adequately prepared for college entrance to secure further training before attempting college work, or they might effect a more intelligent attitude on the part of some whose plans were vaguely indefinite and whose ambition was just 'to go to college,' turn them into other channels, and thus avoid expense to parents and the college and the undeserved criticism that colleges must face in the elimination of this type of student.

"The selective process is exercised more or less by privately endowed colleges and universities. The publicly supported state universities would find it difficult to exercise selection even should they be committed to that policy. It is probable that college entrance based upon thorough self-analysis and self-determination will contribute more to success in college and the elimination of the college failure problem than any superimposed system that might be devised. Certainly it is the more democratic and the safer plan, at least for the state institution, for who shall say which of its citizens are worthy and which are unworthy prospects for state-supported higher education?"

*Christian Science Monitor*

"HUMANICS."<sup>1</sup>—It is natural and inevitable that a young man who comes here to learn should stress Knowledge. It is right that he should. He feels the need of Knowledge and more Knowledge. He is likely to think that this is all he does need. He has not yet reached the stage where he realizes that something more is necessary, if he is to make the fullest use of the Knowledge he has gained. . . . The old man, on the contrary, when he looks backward and recalls how often he has acted foolishly and how much he has lost in time, in effort, and in success, because of unwise procedure, is very likely to stress Knowledge less and exalt Wisdom proportionately. . . .

The problems of active life may be roughly divided into two classes. First, those relating to Nature and natural laws; and second, those having to do mainly with our fellow men. In dealing with the first, Knowledge is in the ascendant and a moderate amount of Wisdom may suffice; but in wrestling with the second class, while Knowledge is still necessary, full use will be found for all Wisdom that can possibly be brought to bear upon the task. The young man who enters the Institute has had at least ten years in the elementary and high schools in quest of Knowledge. Then another period of four years is given

<sup>1</sup> Aldred Lecture, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, January, 1928

to the same pursuit, and if he works for an advanced degree, still other years are devoted to progress in the same direction. During all this time no systematic effort has been made to understand human nature and human relationships and his ideas on these important subjects are merely those which he has picked up at random and are likely to be largely erroneous. And yet, when he goes out into the world to do his constructive work, he is nearly sure to find that he is beset at almost every turn with difficult and vexing problems having to do with the human equation and with personalities inevitably associated with him. Then he will learn by costly and often bitter experiences that these human problems must be answered. He will become aware of the existence of envy, jealousy, spite, hatred, malice, selfishness, avarice, arrogance, injustice, falsehood, double-dealing, and other hateful and destructive influences. He may even discover, to his surprise, that he is not wholly free himself from some of these human blemishes and failings. In any event, he will have to meet them and defend himself from them as best he may, or run the risk of being overwhelmed by them. . .

Now a question presents itself and demands an answer. Is it necessary that young men crammed with learning should go out into the world with no systematic preparation for dealing with these unescapable human problems and be obliged to solve them unaided out of their, as yet, scanty stock of practical wisdom? Is it not possible and is it not highly desirable that an institution like the M. I. T. should have, for the junior and senior years, a chair called "Humanics," or some other appropriate name, which would undertake to instruct students in the fundamentals of human relationship and move them to think seriously about this subject? It would prepare them to some extent to meet inevitable problems and would in many cases call their attention to their own shortcomings. . .

Let us consider for a moment a tentative division of the subject under a number of heads.

1. The proper attitude under varying conditions of a young engineer toward his employer, whether an individual or a corporation.
2. His attitude toward superior officials.
3. His attitude toward those of equal rank in the business.
4. His attitude toward officials of less rank.
5. His attitude toward the rank and file.
6. His attitude toward the lowest grade and least intelligent of workers.

7. His attitude on compensation.
8. His attitude on promotion.
9. His attitude on his effort to render service.
10. His attitude when he believes himself unjustly treated.
11. His attitude when maligned.
12. When it is best to change jobs.
13. The consideration of increasing value as service lengthens, contrasted with new opportunities.
14. Getting along with uncongenial and disagreeable people.
15. Getting along with insincere and dishonest people.
16. What things are worth contending for and what are not.
17. When and how much should one concede or sacrifice.
18. The need of caution when entering into contracts.
19. The need of trying to discover and understand the other man's point of view.
20. The realization that the most satisfactory business is where everybody makes a fair profit.
21. Poor service is dear at any price.
22. The value of optimism.
23. The great value of discretion.
24. The value of eating and sleeping well, whatever happens.

Here are two dozen headings, each one of which would furnish material for a lecture, and the field, I am sure, is not half covered. Can anyone doubt that the young man would profit greatly by thorough discussion and serious consideration of all such topics under competent leadership? If, after two years' attendance at such a course of lectures and discussions, he should bring away nothing but the conviction that one of the greatest mistakes a man can be guilty of is to make an important decision while angry or in any abnormal state of mind, it would justify his having taken the course. . .

WILLIAM EMERY NICKERSON, *Technology Review*

BUSINESS AS A PROFESSION.<sup>1</sup>—Business itself, particularly at the hands of those who understand it best and who represent it best, has undergone a surprisingly notable development within the memory of the present generation. Not long ago a social philosopher of cynical habit sarcastically remarked that the morals and standards of the man of business were essentially the same as those of the pirate and the freebooter. Presumably what this unkindly critic had in

<sup>1</sup> Report of the President of Columbia University, 1926-27

mind was the predominance in business of the gain-seeking motive. But it is just this gain-seeking motive that has been altered in its importance and its incidence by the changes of recent years. To be shut up alone with the gain-seeking instinct and habit during the whole of an active life is the most dreadful punishment that can be visited on mortal man. It is the more dreadful because the sufferer is usually so blissfully unconscious that he has lost anything. Happily, times are changing and men are changing with them. Business, in order to be successful, must now have the support of public opinion and popular approval. Society has it in its power gravely to limit or even to crush any business organization or activity of which it does not approve or which it regards as harmful to itself. In instinctive recognition of this fact, business is coming pretty much everywhere and in almost all its forms to set before itself a new ideal, which is that of gain and service, just as the university has its ideal of scholarship and service. In other words, it is now seen that the gain-seeking motive alone readily becomes a mere manifestation of the predatory instinct and must sooner or later not only injure society but wholly demoralize those who remain subject to that motive alone.

It is only under a democratic social system that the man of business carries weight or gains respect. Under every other form of social order he is looked down upon as an inferior who is a necessary and useful hewer of wood and drawer of water, to be paid something for his services. . .

With this conception of business it is obvious that professional preparation for it finds a natural place in the university, by the side of the older forms of occupation that have so long attracted the best and most ambitious of men. . . In other words, there is coming to be a philosophy of business as there has long been a philosophy of theology, of law, of medicine, and of teaching, and it is through the door of that philosophy, that understanding of fundamental principles and higher standards, that the university will seek to lead men and women to prepare themselves for the capable and competent pursuit of this form of intellectual activity and public service. The old-fashioned so-called practical man who worked by rule of thumb and was proud of his ignorance is passing. His place is being taken by a higher, a better trained, and a more public-spirited type. To promote this change and to assist it is one of the glad functions of the university.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

## BOSTON MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE.—

1. *The Curtis-Reed Bill.*—The welfare of the children now enrolled in the schools of the United States is dependent upon our ability to make available to boards of education, to superintendents of schools, and to teachers throughout the nation the results of current practice, of experiments wherever they are conducted, and of the results of scientific investigation.

The federal government has long accepted responsibility for conducting inquiries and disseminating information concerning the public schools.

We hold that economy and efficiency demand that the activities of the federal government dealing with education be consolidated in a Department of Education under the leadership of a secretary with a seat in the president's cabinet. We urge that adequate support be provided for his Department in order that it may conduct such inquiries and disseminate such information as will make for the highest degree of efficiency in all of our schools. We know that this service can be rendered without in any way interfering with the constitutional right of the several states to control, administer, and supervise their own schools. We, therefore, urge the Congress to pass the Curtis-Reed Bill which embodies the program which this Association has consistently advocated throughout its history. . .

3. *School Costs.*—Any just consideration of the costs of our schools must take into account the depreciation in the dollar, the demand of the public for ever broader educational service, the ability of the public to pay and, above all else, the vital importance of education in a democracy. It is only through the development of people that material values are enhanced. Only by such development is life as a whole made more worth while. Education, conceived of as an investment in life itself, justifies substantial expenditure upon it. Extravagance is inexcusable. Every proposed expansion of educational facilities should be carefully studied. We should continually weigh the results, so far as we can define them, against the costs, and, as individuals and as a profession, we should not lack the courage to take our place in the front ranks of the battle for better educational opportunities for all people. There is no evidence that the standard of living has been lowered by the cost of education. On the other hand there is every indication that it has been raised. So long as this is true there is no cause for alarm over the present percentage of our national income given to education. . .



5. *Are too Many Seeking Admission to Higher Schools, Colleges, and Universities?*—The committee feels that the issue presented by this question cannot be satisfactorily met by arbitrary systems of selection and elimination. Institutions and systems themselves as well as people must be tested. Until this is done we do not know what the possibilities are. In the meantime it is more constructive to give the benefits of doubts to human beings rather than to systems which are likely to be overly traditionalized. In the final analysis this is the problem of making scientific adjustment to all types of people. In all probability the higher educational institutions will have to continue to make broader adaptations to individual differences among ever-increasing numbers. Our American schools should not revert to a caste system philosophy. Caste systems have had ample time in which to prove their superiority, but what have they to show for themselves? Our school system is young but it is based on the most persistent ideals we know of, the ideals of democracy.

The elementary school has been well established on this ideal. But let us not forget that this was not accomplished without a bitter battle. The same forces in the main which now are so alarmed over the growth of our higher schools fought the establishment of the free tax supported elementary school. It has always been so. Our profession should lead the battle for ever better educational opportunities for all the people. . .

We believe that there are many instances of interference with schools due to the conception that the management of education is subject to the spoils system in partisan politics. Protective measures against the baneful results of such a misconception can properly be urged in view of the decisions rendered by the supreme courts of many states which decisions have declared in unequivocal terms that boards of education are independent bodies created under the authority of the state with independent responsibility for the conduct of the schools and that such boards and their officers must not be made subject in any of their operations to the caprices of local partisan control. . .

W. CARSON RYAN, JR., Swarthmore College,  
*School and Society*, vol. xxvii, no. 689

THE RELATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS TO COLLEGES.<sup>1</sup>—Looking over some figures of the cost of education—or rather of the cost of

<sup>1</sup> Address at the opening session of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Boston, February 27, 1928

teachers' salaries—per pupil for the last fifteen years one may note some significant facts. A score of the larger cities of Massachusetts (not including Boston) show an average increase of the expenditure for salaries per pupil from \$25.40 in 1911-12 to \$62.70 in 1926-27, the more rapid growth being in the elementary grades. At the earlier date the costs for primary and secondary schools are not given separately; but taking a later year we find that in the ten years from 1916-17 to 1926-27 the cost per pupil in the elementary schools has risen from \$28.80 to \$67.85, and in the high schools from \$52.07 to \$104.00.

A considerable part of this increase is due to the fall in the value of money, but this by no means accounts for the whole change, for there is no doubt that education from the kindergarten to the university is becoming more expensive. It may be interesting therefore, to compare the foregoing figures with those for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard. In doing so one must remember that this faculty covers both the College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; that the instructing staff is devoting no small part of its time to research as well as to teaching; and that during the last fifteen years a system of general examinations and tutors has been introduced in almost all the departments of the college, and this has involved a larger addition to the number of teachers. The cost per student there in 1911-12 was \$183.38 and in 1926-27 \$305.00, an increase of sixty-seven per cent; while in the same period the cost of salaries per pupil in the public schools of the cities considered had enlarged one hundred and sixty-seven per cent. The public may well ask itself why so rapid an increase and whereunto it will grow. The teaching profession sees no need of a limit, but the public is likely to differ with that view. We may ask whether the problem of this generation is not to make universal education effective, and that of the next will not be to make it equally good and less expensive.

The more immediate question is that of effectiveness, why should not secondary schools in America, as in England, France, and Germany, finish secondary education by the time the pupils are in their nineteenth year, the age at which they graduate therefrom in all these countries? That they do not do so in this country is universally admitted, with the result that the colleges devote one or two years—usually two—to instruction of a secondary nature before the student is prepared for work of university grades. Some colleges are there-

fore proposing to divide their courses into two distinct parts, the first two years being frankly of secondary character; and all over the country, increasingly as one travels westward, junior colleges are being set up which are not really colleges, but schools for continuing secondary education. . .

Are we not also striving to teach too many things? There is a constant tendency to introduce new subjects good in themselves, but which crowd out, not from the list of subjects taught, but from the studies of the individual, things of a larger educational value. One of the defects we observe in not a few candidates for admission to college is a dispersion of high-school studies over many fields, no one of which has been pursued long enough to give a thorough grasp of the subject. Education consists less in the number of things a boy has glanced at than in the way he has learned to regard them. What we need is a good mental training, an accurate and thorough habit of mind; not a frittering away of the attention by a multitude of small matters of which the pupil does not get enough to develop consecutive thought. There is a special disadvantage in the inclusion of subjects which he is not mature enough to study thoroughly, and sometimes the teacher does not know profoundly enough to use in training the mind.

Another element in the problem that has not, I think, received the consideration it deserves may be illustrated by a simple algebraic formula. If we express the product of any educational process, the benefit obtained by the pupil who has gone through it, by  $P$ , then, in a very rough way and leaving out of account other factors not germane in this particular inquiry, we may write

$$(X + 1) Y C = P$$

where the constant  $C$  is the inborn ability of the pupil in question,  $X$  is the quality of the instruction, and  $Y$  is the amount of the pupil's personal efforts (by no means the same as the mere time spent in study, but rather dependent upon the intensity of application).

I write the formula thus, because if there be no effort whatever, voluntary or induced, by the pupil, or if he have no intelligence of any kind, there can be no education, and the product is zero. Whereas, without teaching above the elementary stages extraordinary personal effort and great natural ability produced the education of Benjamin Franklin. In short, there may be self-education without teaching but there can be none without effort and intelligence on the

part of the pupil, however good the instruction. Nor is the formula in other ways inaccurate, for a doubling of the pupil's effort doubles the effect of good instruction, and the better the teaching the greater the earnestness of the pupil's effort.

Have we not thought too exclusively about enlarging the product by increasing the  $X$ , with comparatively small attention to the factor  $Y$ ? . . .

No doubt, also, all teachers are aware of the importance of voluntary cooperation on the part of the pupil. There has been an overwhelming revulsion against the drudgery of dull disciplinary tasks that breed disgust with school and all its mechanism. An attempt has been made to render study pleasant, but often, unfortunately, by making it easy. . .

Too much attention has, I think, been paid to making education attractive by smoothing the path, as compared with inducing strenuous voluntary effort, but this involves doing things that require exertion, and therefore are not at the time wholly pleasurable. Repeated mental exertion becomes a habit, one of the most valuable a man can possess. In fact the habit of overcoming obstacles is a large factor in the condition of mind that is properly called education; for the quantity of knowledge obtained when one leaves school is far less important than the ability to acquire knowledge and to think clearly on hard problems.

The colleges desire from the schools precisely what they are themselves trying to cultivate in their students, a greater sense of responsibility for their own education, and a willingness, nay a desire, to make the effort required to the best of their ability. Perhaps a more careful attention to the problem of self-education, its conditions, its possibilities, and its limitations may hereafter prove to be the road towards economy as well as efficiency.

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL, Harvard University

THE GERMAN UNIVERSITY AND THE AMERICAN.— . . The contrast between the freedom of scholarship in Germany and the limitations of scholarship in the presumed new world of freedom is impressive. In not a few commonwealths of the American Union, in their institutions of the higher learning, intolerance is a prevailing atmosphere. This mood especially has touched the teaching of biological science. A special Committee of the American Association of University Professors has recently said:

Attempts have been made to secure the passage of laws forbidding such teaching in state-supported institutions of learning, and teachers of biology in a number of colleges have been dismissed on account of their promulgation of evolutionary doctrines. These occurrences have aroused in the teaching profession, and also in the general public, considerable concern over the maintenance of that freedom of thought and speech which Americans have regarded as one of their most valued possessions.<sup>1</sup>

The principle, which is thus intimated, even by contrast, is supported by the liberty of teaching and of learning of the German university. The lesson is the lesson of giving full trustfulness to the true scholar and to the wise teacher. . .

Among most peoples the teacher fills one of the noblest places in their hall of service and of recognition. . . It is in the systems of education of the United States that there is found the direst and most direct need of a distinct lifting of the appreciation of the teaching office. Toward such an appreciation the American student, coming from circles wherein the teacher commands peculiar respect, makes a rich and much-needed contribution. . .

In one respect a direct method should be employed. It is a method of a vast increase in the stipends paid to teachers of every grade, and especially of the university type. Such an increase would not immediately give the desired result but, in a decade, it would cause the drawing into the profession of a type of teachers of higher ideals. . . and of an efficiency far richer. . .

Some of the advantages which the American student recognizes and represents as he comes back from his German university include an enhanced appreciation of the value of truth, of scholarship, of learning, of thinking, of the intellect as the tool and instrument of thinking and of learning, of the worth of thoroughness in all intellectual processes. He returns possessed with a keen sense of academic freedom which he finds limited in the house of his friends. He, having prepared himself to become a teacher, recognizes the worth of the calling, as both an individualistic and a social force. He also, coming back to a country of individualisms, feels, and feels keenly, the value of all communal institutions. Yet, in his possession of increased riches, the student does not fail to recognize, and to confess, that certain poverties accompany his enlarging worth. . .

The first is, indeed, the defect of an excellence. The education is relatively too intellectual. Germany is a nation of philosophers

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin of the Association*, February, 1925



and of scientists. Its over-intellectuality begins early, and continues to the end. It is based on an interpretation that man has one, and only one, faculty, and that this faculty exercises only one function. That single faculty is the intellect, and that single function is learning. Germany, a people distinguished in certain relations for its sentimentalism, fails to recognize properly the place of the feelings, or the esthetic values (except in music), or the sense of communal, social duties. . .

This quartette of defects, or weaknesses, of the German university system—over-intellectualism, chauvinism, bureaucracy, undue specialization—are to be weighed and evaluated. Yet, when they are thus estimated, it will become evident that they do not disintegrate the whole comprehensive worth which the German system has contributed to the higher liberal education of the new world. In this time of international suspicions and of hatreds, of anxious doubtfulness and of uncertainty touching the immediate or the remote future, of changing interpretations—political, social, racial, religious, economic, educational—it is of the highest importance that one should interpret the problems of the higher learning and teaching, belonging to both America and Germany, in wholeness and in sanity. A comparison of the credits and debits proves how great is the contribution made by the German university to higher education in America.

CHARLES F. THWING, Western Reserve University,  
*School and Society*, vol. xxvii, no. 687

STUDENT ATHLETES.<sup>1</sup>—A football team, or any other athletic team, ought to grow out of the life of an educational institution just as naturally as do, for example, its dramatic or musical teams. It ought, in other words, to be truly representative, to represent a natural cross-section of the life of its institution. What we need is not athletes playing at being students, but student athletes. In student athletics I believe firmly and wholly; in professional athletics within our colleges and universities, not at all. In much of the discussion which draws more or less arbitrary lines here or there between the professional and the amateur—in what some one has called "the metaphysics of college athletics"—I confess I have little interest. We will not go so very far wrong, it seems to me, if we keep in mind certain general principles. First, any athletic team ought to be made up of genuine students. I mean of men attracted

<sup>1</sup> Report of the President of the University of North Carolina, 1926-27

to a given institution in a normal way, and not altogether or primarily because it offers a satisfactory arena for the display of athletic prowess or because of any special inducement for the same. I mean also of students genuine in the sense that they are concerned about getting an education, not viewing the reasonable demands of classroom and campus as unwelcome interruptions between opportunities for their real mission in life. Second, any athletic program should be one which, as its ideal, involves every member of the student body in wholesome physical activity, and so finds in the teams which represent the institution in intercollegiate contests a natural outgrowth of its life.

That there are evils inherent in intercollegiate contests no one would deny. They have been discussed many times. But intercollegiate athletics are here to stay. They represent an interest in our American collegiate and public life which is too real and vivid easily to disappear. Nor must we overlook the good. The clean thrill of fine sportsmanship and superior physical endeavor, the healthy rivalry, the acclaiming of physical prowess that is as old as the race, the pageantry—all these things youth and age alike prize too dearly easily to abandon, and these things find, after all, their finest expression in our intercollegiate contests. Ceaseless attacks on the evils there must be, but we should not forget the natural and normal character of such contests in condemning, as we should condemn, abuses which arise.

Third, there is the question of the professional coach. The athletic coaching system of American colleges is, in itself, an expression of a desire to give our athletes the benefit of the same sort of skilled instruction that man may avail themselves of in any activity in which they are interested. In American college life, the movement is toward, not away from, such technical and skilled instruction. Intercollegiate debating, for example, is coming more and more into the hands of professional coaches, as, in a somewhat different way, are dramatics and music. All this represents a viewpoint toward student activities which is radically different from that which obtains, say, in English student life, but which has evolved naturally enough out of our American attitude toward such things. Of this attitude the professional coach in athletics is an expression. Of it he becomes an abnormal expression when he conceives of himself as an agent of this or that team and forgets the institution as a whole—its standards, its life, its activities of which his is but one. He may suffer,

in other words, from precisely the same lack of perspective which now and then afflicts the college teacher who, immersed in plans for the growth of his own particular department, forgets his relationship, and that of his specialty, to education as a whole, and, for him, the college may come to exist in order to turn out a winning football team, as to another it may find its success measured by the number of Sanskrit or of the history of pre-dynastic Egypt specialists that it develops. Such losses of perspective are natural and human. I do not believe that athletic coaches are more liable to them than are other specialists. Their correction is a part of the large problem of relating specialties to a comprehensive ideal of what the American college ought to be and to do that lies near the heart of the problem of our undergraduate life of today. . . it certainly cannot be dealt with within the limits of this report.

H. W. CHASE, University of North Carolina

WHAT PRICE HONOR.—The "greased ways" of public education and its standardized promotions might better stop short with high-school graduation. From that point opportunity and responsibility should join hands, and they would join hands if entrance to college were by examination alone—examination chiefly of character, of purpose, and of desire, a proved desire to get something out of college beyond the mere going through.

The college A.B. should be scrapped or it should be redeemed; and is there any other way to redeem it than through competition? If the A.B. degree be given only to the upper half or upper third of a graduating class, it might suddenly assume new value. Let the very exceptional few of the top-notch group be honored even more. I propose a rank heresy; but who cares a rap today about a *magna cum* or a *summa cum laude* three days after graduation? Our colleges are granting M.A. degrees for honor to graduates whose post-college intellectual achievements are absolutely nil. These are mere *friends* of the college or of certain powerful members of the committee in charge of honorary degrees. Cancel this practice and redeem the M.A. degree as well. Honor these "friends" in some other way—carve their features in stone on the college gates, or what you will—but don't call them Masters of the Arts, which some of them, at least, decidedly are not. But for the upper and very small fraction of college graduates, for those who emerge as demonstrated scholars in a chosen field, masters of themselves and of their subject,

an honor to their college and to their instructors—and there are such in all institutions—the Mastership of Arts is relatively at least none too significant, none too high a reward for proved superiority among the many of lesser attainment. Heresy? Safeguard the award even further by requirement of still more searching, comprehensive examinations. Still heresy! Well, then, what are the colleges going to do for the sanctification of their academic awards? Will somebody else please take the case?

G. H. MOORE, *What the Colleges Are Doing*,  
March, 1928

THE PATHFINDERS IN THE WILDERNESS.<sup>1</sup> . . . George Washington not only was known as a pathfinder in the wilderness. He was a realist as well as an idealist—practical as opposed to theoretical. It was fortunate for America that he stood preeminent among the men of his time for his commonsense.

One feels a need for this most uncommon trait called commonsense in solving many of the problems of undergraduate education. . .

One of these principles relates to our gain in undergraduate attendance. We have this year the largest enrolment in our history, and one of the major increases among the universities of the West. Despite the popular fear regarding the number of students going to college, and the consequent occasional threat to limit attendance, commonsense tells us we are going to provide an education for every son and daughter in the State of Washington who wants it sincerely and who has the mental capacity to receive it. There may be complaints—we must expect them always—but education will be provided by the State of Washington for those who deserve it, no matter in what numbers the students come.

Commonsense, however, tells us we have been giving the stamp of a university education to too many youths whose mental capacity has not reached beyond the freshman or sophomore year. We must plan our university curriculum—and that promptly—to take care of those who cannot continue beyond the first or second year, or who are not entitled to do so; and then we must see to it that such students, having been accurately appraised, stop there. To every boy or girl an opportunity, but to no boy or girl an opportunity beyond his deserts. . .

Commonsense tells us, too, that our university, if it expects to

<sup>1</sup> Inaugural Address, University of Washington, February 22, 1928

maintain its place of prestige in the state—if, indeed, it expects to exist at all—must represent the life of this commonwealth and must minister to that life. . .

Interpreted to apply to our situation in the State of Washington, this means that we must adjust our curriculum to our students, not our students to our curriculum.

If this premise be sound—and I think there is none who will deny it—it gives us a rock basis on which to build a structure for undergraduate education that will meet the needs of the youth of our state. These needs may be summarized under four heads: health, economic and vocational guidance, citizenship, and knowledge and appreciation of the things of the spirit. Necessity for brevity prevents me from doing more than summarize reasons for those four points.

I put health first because it is fundamental to success and happiness in life. We may garner the wisdom of the ages, but if we have not health, our lives become a curse to ourselves and oftentimes a menace to those of others. Before graduation, therefore, every student should be taught by skilled instructors how to keep in sound physical condition. . .

Second, every student should be given economic and vocational guidance. This is of two kinds. One would enable the future citizen to take care of his personal business affairs, no matter what his vocation might be. . . And one of the duties this university owes its graduates is to provide practical business education that will enable them to protect themselves and their families financially.

Vocational guidance in the sense I mean it does not concern itself alone with training for a specific profession, but with personal guidance of the student into the field where he will be more likely to attain success. . . I may add that I favor business and professional education. Every male student ought to be able to determine before finishing his junior year the precise vocation into which he is going. The curricula of many of our professional schools, however, need revision, with a view to providing more horizon-widening studies and making profit and service their aims, to correspond with the accepted purpose of scholarship and service in the colleges of arts and sciences. Men who graduate from the professional schools, if they possess the highest type of mind, find always that they attain their fullest success in business and their greatest happiness in life as much by the horizons of information they have as by the technical training received in specialized fields. . .



My third point, citizenship, is obvious enough not to necessitate argument before a thoughtful audience. The majority of our population is insensible to the needs of conscientious, educated citizenship. Our commonwealth is suffering accordingly. . . What we need in undergraduate education is continuing stress, not alone on forms and methods of government, but on the personal responsibility of the individual for righteous government and direction of the affairs of our state. Not until our students are educated to feel themselves an integral part of government will they have the personal interest in its direction and assume the active leadership that we need from them if our state is to take its rightful place in the affairs of our nation.

My fourth point, knowledge of the things of the spirit, is intuition in what is known in a more or less hazy way as culture, a shibboleth too often used to conceal academic aimlessness. . .

Value does not reside, however, in the mere act of making a living, in eating, drinking, housing ourselves comfortably, and in securing monetary gain. The highest values are in the things of the spirit. We work in order to have leisure; and according as we spend that leisure we have our purest pleasures and our greatest happiness in life, for it is in our leisure hours that we enjoy most fully our spiritual possessions. We need education, therefore, for avocation, for the mental horizons that give breadth of vision and richness of life. . .

The United States, however, because of the brevity of its life and the circumstances of its growth, has been trained for work. It has been geared for labor and struggle and strain. It has not had adequate education for leisure. In consequence, it has idle hours which it is wasting on things that are unworthy. There are those indeed who believe that as a nation we are threatened by a vast amount of leisure, which may destroy us because we lack the culture and the character to give it value.

In these facts and conclusions lies our need for emphasis on knowledge and appreciation of the things of the spirit. Though a liberal education is not materialistic, it is nevertheless immensely practical. It enriches life and builds character, without which there can be no true education. Because of these facts it must ever remain the heart of our university curriculum. . .

M. LYLE SPENCER, University of Washington

VACATION CUM LAUDE.—"Whenever a college man applies to me for a job I never inquire about his scholastic standing," recently

remarked a business man, himself a university graduate. "What I want to know is how he spent his summer vacations—three months per annum, and before he gets his degree that amounts to a whole year, the most valuable, I think, of his entire collegiate course. Never again will he have a similar opportunity. If he has wasted it, I know something about him; if not, he has a record worth showing. . .

"Here's the record of one boy I've just employed," this man continued. "At the end of his freshman year he went for one month to a citizen's military camp; after sophomore year he worked for six weeks with Dr. Grenfell's mission in Labrador; at the close of junior year he had a month and a half with the Banks fishing fleet; and after graduation he spent July and August with a forestry outfit. All of it was open-air work, putting him in good physical condition and in touch with all sorts and conditions of men. He used only twenty-six of the forty-eight free weeks at his disposal, but I don't care what he did with the others. Those twenty-six weeks were what I call a 'vacation *cum laude*.' They gave him an unusual equipment for success and I only wish I could find more young men who possessed it."

*New York Evening Post*

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, BOARD OF SOCIAL SERVICE AND RELIGION.—Eight faculty members and eight students have been appointed by President Mason to the Board of Social Service and Religion which is to organize a constructive program for the religious interests of the university. Compulsory chapel was abolished last spring. The Board does not plan to maintain any single dogmatic formulation of religion, nor to establish a university church, nor to organize the religious life of the university upon exclusively ecclesiastical models; it will seek to cooperate as far as practicable with all the churches of the neighborhood but it conceives its function to be the discovery and expression of the religious life of the university itself.

SUMMER COURSES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS.—Courses for administrative officers will be offered again during the summer quarter. During the week of July 16 these courses will be supplemented by the Third Annual Institute on Higher Education to which administrative officers in colleges, universities, and teacher-training institutions are invited.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY FILM FOUNDATION.—The University Film Foundation has been organized to cooperate with the faculty and other members of the staff of Harvard University in the collection and production of films and photographs in the fields of science and education.

The foundation has entered into an agreement with the president and fellows of Harvard College, according to the terms of which Harvard University will permit the foundation to use such equipment and other facilities as the college may determine are available, and will encourage the members of its faculty to cooperate in the production of the films. The foundation will be permitted to state that its films have been produced in collaboration with the faculty and staff of Harvard University. Furthermore, though not included in the contract, the university is willing to provide the foundation with a site upon university ground for the erection of a building to belong to the university and not for the sale or rental of films. In return for these privileges, the foundation will place its collection of films and photographs and its motion picture equipment at the disposal of Harvard University for the purpose of instruction and scientific research.

The foundation has its own corporate entity and has been granted a Massachusetts charter as an educational and charitable organization. All of the proceeds will be devoted to advancing the work. The foundation is designed to be self-supporting through its income from the sale and distribution of its material to schools, universities, museums, churches, clubs, and so forth.

The foundation plans to collect films and photographs of educational and scientific value from organizations and individuals all over the world, to co-operate with scientists and explorers, and record research experiments of permanent value in university and industrial laboratories.

The foundation will immediately undertake the production of series of films on the fundamentals of the more common arts and sciences: botany, zoology, physics, chemistry, geography, anthropology, geology, astronomy, and the fine arts. The program for the first year calls for the production of three one-reel films which can be used in science courses in schools and elementary courses in colleges and will be of general interest elsewhere. The program also includes the editing of a series of a dozen films, three or four reels in length each, which have been taken on expeditions and depict the life and customs of peoples in different parts of the world. The production schedules for the following years will gradually increase in size and scope. They will, it is hoped, include production in other branches of art and sciences, in medicine, public health, physical training, vocational guidance, industry, and commerce.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, SELECTION OF A PRESIDENT.—President Goodnow has informed the Board of Trustees of his desire to resign his office not later than the end of the academic year 1928-29. A committee of five trustees (Messrs. Daniel Willard, *Chairman*; Newton D. Baker, B. Howell Griswold, Jr., C. P. Howland, and F. W. Wood) has been appointed to submit recommendations to the Board for the selection of a successor to Dr. Goodnow; and at the Board's request there has been associated with this committee in an advisory capacity a committee consisting of one representative elected by each of the four faculties of the university. The members of the advisory committee are Dr. W. H. Howell, representing the School of Hygiene and Public Health, Dr. A. O. Lovejoy, representing the Philosophical Faculty, Dr. J. B. Whitehead, representing the School of Engineering, and Dr. L. H. Weed, representing the Medical Faculty.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE.—The following statement aims to bring the local situation up to date since the publication of the report in the October *Bulletin*. Early in the fall recommendations concerning the administrative laws and curriculum of the University of Louisville were made by President F. L. McVey of the University of Kentucky and Dean F. J. Kelly of the University of Minnesota. Neither of these deals directly with the trouble at the University. President McVey formulated for the University of Louisville a set of laws for government, which have been adopted by the Board of Trustees in some form. The exact form is unknown to the faculty, as the matter was not opened for discussion by the faculty and copies of the accepted rules have not been made available. However, before accepting the McVey organization, which incorporated a procedure in case of dismissal, the Board dismissed, after seventeen years of service, W. M. Anderson, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Professor of Physics. The only reasons given were lack of harmony as evidenced by criticism of the McVey and Kelly recommendations. When Dean Anderson pointed out that his opinions upon these recommendations had been requested, and asked for more definite charges, the Board refused to make any further comment. At the same meeting of the Board an Assistant Professor of Chemistry was dismissed, admittedly not because of incompetence, at the request of a department head.

As a result of the above actions six more members of the Faculty resigned immediately in protest, and it is likely that other resignations will follow. In less than two years of Mr. Colvin's presidency there have been twenty-five dismissals. The seriousness of the situation can be further seen in the fact that so far as is known no contracts or appointments for the coming year have been made by the Board.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, SALARY DIFFERENTIAL FUND.<sup>1</sup>—In examining the changes in the faculty we have been impressed with the constant difficulty the university experiences in retaining the services of so many of its distinguished teachers in the face of competition from institutions in the North and the Middle West—institutions ranking no higher in the academic world than our own, but able to offer larger salaries. Under such conditions we are in unusual danger of losing our best men.

The way to meet this situation, it seems to your committee, is

<sup>1</sup> Report of the Visiting Committee, 1927



not by raising the general salary scale but by a method analogous to that of the present Kenan Foundation. By means of income from that foundation the university is able to reward distinguished service by raising certain salaries above the normal scale. But these funds are not sufficient to care for the number of men who amply deserve this recognition. We recommend, therefore, that in the maintenance funds of the university there be set up a "Salary Differential Fund" to be administered by the President and Trustees in some such way as the Kenan Fund is now administered to reward unusual merit or to meet emergencies in the problem of retaining our faculty. . .

In a small institution, such as was the university when our present methods of dealing with salary increases were adopted many years ago, there is much to be said in favor of salary scales more or less automatic in character. In an institution of the character and complexity of the university of today, on the other hand, greater freedom and flexibility should be available. It should be possible, for example, to recognize unusual service more freely and under a greater range of circumstances. . .

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, DEAN OF THE CHAPEL.—Princeton has appointed a Dean of the Chapel, Rev. Dr. Robert Russell Wicks, now pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Holyoke and chaplain of Mount Holyoke College. "The work," says Dr. Wicks, "will involve some teaching and a course on the method of working out one's own religious convictions will be offered to underclassmen. At the same time there will be a chance for the kind of work which was done at Mount Holyoke College in informal conversations with groups of students. To facilitate these informal contacts a home is to be provided in the country, just on the edge of the town, where the students can come for fireside conversations.

"In addition to this will be the main task of organizing the work of the college chapel. A remarkable Gothic building is just being finished. It seats two thousand people. Its great chancel affords an opportunity for developing the kind of choirs that are becoming famous in Harvard and Yale.

"The minister in this chapel will do considerable preaching and will call in a board of preachers chosen from among the leading clergymen in the country. Once a month he will be free to go out in other colleges and churches.

"Just how the religious work of the college will be organized around this chapel will depend on the cooperation of the students. If their interest can be enlisted, the possibilities are open for working toward a college church untrammelled by denominational limitations and free to experiment in building up the kind of institution which the younger generation would like to see duplicated in the communities to which they go after graduation. The entire scheme is one which cannot be prescribed in advance, but which must be worked out through close cooperation with the student themselves."

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING.—Twenty-three years after the inauguration of the first courses in engineering a college of engineering has been created which will open its doors in September. The college will be made up of five major divisions each with a separate chairman: Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Petroleum Engineering. In addition to the four-year courses leading to degrees of bachelor of science in any of the divisions of engineering, and master's degrees for graduate work, there has been established the degree of civil engineer for distinction in the practice of engineering.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE.—The work of the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin has entered upon its second stage—the program which will carry through nearly all the remainder of the year.

The first ten weeks of the college found the one hundred and twenty freshman students and their eleven advisers digging into the translations of the works of great Greek historians, philosophers, and writers of literature, and modern comments on the period, in an endeavor to build up an understanding of the whole civilization of Athens in its "golden age."

From now on the group will continue to read the literature of the Greeks and of commentators on their lives and times, but will also study intensively different aspects of their civilization. The work started with a study of economics. It will go forward to religion, art, science, drama, etc. Members of the Experimental College adviser group especially versed in each subject will direct each period of specialized work.

By the end of the year each student will be expected to have studied

carefully twenty-two works of eight famous Greeks—Thucydides, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes. He also will be expected to have mastered studies by nine modern interpreters of Greek civilization.

Besides the reading, each student is charged with the responsibility of studying carefully seven famous buildings of Athens, the sculpture on these buildings, and three others at other ancient Greek cities, and ten items of original Greek sculpture, as well as vases by six famous Greek craftsmen.

In addition, he will be expected to have a general knowledge or specified writings of ten other Greeks and of nine other commentators; the architecture and sculpture of fourteen other buildings, the sculpture of eight copies of certain Greek originals, and the characteristics of a few vases of eight other craftsmen.

*New York Times*, February 2

YALE UNIVERSITY, PH.D.'S.—It is sometimes asked whether students who proceed to the doctorate follow in after years the profession for which they prepare, or whether they soon drift into other occupations. An examination of the Yale list shows that of those now living ninety-five per cent are engaged in some form of work, educational or professional, in their original or related fields of study. This percentage is probably higher than in law and divinity, and may be equalled only in medicine.

WILBUR L. CROSS, Dean of the Graduate School

WEST CHESTER NORMAL SCHOOL. Statement by Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure.—The West Chester State Normal School of West Chester, Pennsylvania, not being on the accredited list of the American Council on Education, would not naturally engage the attention of Committee A, but concern having been expressed in the situation there by various members of the Association it seems appropriate to publish the following brief statement of what appear to be the essential facts.

The controversy centers about Dr. Robert T. Kerlin and Professor John A. Kinneman. The former had been a teacher at the School since 1922 and was the head of the English Department. The latter had been at the School for at least two years and was a member of the Political Science Department. During April, 1927, announcement was made that Dr. Kerlin and Professor Kinneman would not

be given new contracts for the academic year 1927-28. At the same time it was announced that certain other teachers would not be given new contracts. About the time these announcements were made the Liberal Club of the School had held a meeting at which the Nicaraguan policy of President Coolidge was criticized. Dr. Kerlin and Professor Kinneman participated in this meeting. Vigorous attacks against the two professors and the Liberal Club were launched by the Schlegel American Legion Post and others.

The determination not to offer new contracts to Dr. Kerlin and Professor Kinneman was reached without consulting either of the teachers, without giving them any specification of charges, and of course without giving them a hearing. The Chairman of Committee A is informed that the determination not to retain these two gentlemen was reached about a month before the meeting of the Liberal Club above referred to. The summary procedure employed in dispensing with their services has however led to grave suspicion in many quarters that their advanced social and political views were the real cause of their dismissal. On this point it is not intended to express any opinion. But the case certainly furnishes another illustration of the unfortunate results caused by dropping professors of established standing without giving them a fair opportunity to defend themselves.

## MEMBERSHIP

### MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and fifty members, as follows:

**Amherst College**, Theodore Baird; **Antioch College**, C. S. Adams, Vivian H. Bresnahan, J. D. Dawson, P. S. Dwyer, E. D. Everdell, C. E. Kennedy, W. M. Leiserson, D. A. Magruder, C. W. Putnam, A. C. Swinnerton, Grace K. Willett; **Boston University**, Lilah M. Vaughan, I. H. White; **Bucknell University**, R. B. Ransom; **University of Buffalo**, L. M. Monell; **University of California** (Berkeley), C. A. Gulick, Jr., C. H. Mowbray, P. B. Schaeffer; **Carleton College**, F. L. Bardwell, I. M. Cochran, P. R. Fossum, H. Loss; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, J. M. Klamon, Nathan Miller, J. L. Sheean; **Central Missouri State Teachers' College**, E. E. Bayles, Maude Beamer, Elizabeth Callaway, L. Eugenia Deller, Ruth Fitzgerald, Gladys Goss; **University of Chattanooga**, Terrell L. Tatum; **Coker College**, J. McB. Dabbs, P. S. Flippin; **University of Colorado**, E. F. Meyer; **Columbia University**, P. T. Moon, A. T. Poffenberger, C. J. Warden; **University of Delaware**, C. C. Palmer; **DePauw University**, L. R. Eckardt, C. D. W. Hildebrand, R. T. Stephenson; **University of Detroit**, B. N. Blakeslee, P. P. Harbrecht, C. H. Heithaus, L. K. Kirk; **Duke University**, F. K. Mitchell, F. A. Wolf; **Fordham University**, W. F. Cunningham, J. A. Murphy; **Georgia State College for Women**, Mary B. Gray, G. H. Webber, W. T. Wynn; **George Washington University**, C. D. Baker, Tomas Cajigas, O. B. Hunter, A. L. Smith; **Hamline University**, C. S. Templer; **Harvard University**, C. H. Haring; **Hood College**, Gladys Trevithick; **Hunter College**, Louise Hartt; **University of Illinois**, E. C. Baldwin; **Indiana University**, Amelia Louise Peters, E. L. Yeager; **Iowa State College**, O. W. Chapman, R. M. Hixon, O. E. Lowman, O. Settles, Erma A. Smith, Grace Zorbaugh; **University of Iowa**, Bessie Louise Pierce, C. S. Tippetts; **University of Kentucky**, E. Z. Palmer; **Lafayette College**, Mark Balderston, J. A. Benner, H. E. Brown, H. W. Church, E. R. Closson, H. J. Kennard, W. C. M. Quarrie, G. A. Menge; **Lake Forest College**, Mabel Powell; **Lehigh University**, Fort Tomlinson, E. B. Schulz; **University of Louisiana**, C. H. Bean, I. P. Foote, P. C. Young; **Marietta College**, G. J. Blazier; **Marquette University**, W. M.



Murphy; **University of Maryland**, H. A. Deferrari, H. C. House, J. T. Spann; **Mills College**, Carrie C. Dozier; **University of Missouri**, Emma Canthorn; **Nebraska Wesleyan University**, F. A. Alabaster; **University of Nebraska**, C. G. Lowe; **University of New Hampshire**, T. V. Kalijaryi; **University of North Carolina**, C. D. Beers, L. M. Lear; **Northwestern University**, H. F. Harrington, E. H. Hatton, G. S. Wehrwein; **Oberlin College**, C. D. Burt, P. N. MacEachron; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, R. L. Newlin, G. L. Nichols; **University of Oklahoma**, W. E. McClure; **University of Oregon**, Delbert Oberteuffer; **Pennsylvania State College**, Elisabeth W. W. Dye, A. Leah Gause, J. T. Law; **University of Pittsburgh**, P. W. Whiting; **Purdue University**, R. D. Perry; **College of St. Teresa**, William Caillonette; **Seton Hill College**, F. W. Bennett, Helen C. Schmadel, A. Pauline Sanders; **Smith College**, J. S. Bixler, H. A. Meyerhoff; **University of Southern California**, W. R. LaPorte, F. F. Neal, Florence R. Scott; **South Dakota State College**, William Asker, G. I. Gilbertson, Ina M. Greer, A. S. Harding, George McCarty, Catherine F. MacLaggan; **Sweet Briar College**, Emily H. Dutton; **Syracuse University**, Samuel Cahan; **University of Toledo**, Clara E. Goehrke, T. W. Ray; **Washington State College**, Lawrence Clark, A. E. Drucker, R. W. Gelbach, R. D. Sloan; **Washington University**, H. M. Miller, Jr.; **College of William and Mary**, A. F. Dolloff, Tucker Jones; **Williams College**, L. E. Brett, W. M. Pierce, T. C. Smith, M. A. Vaccariello; **Wittenberg College**, O. M. Mehus; **Yale University**, H. E. Himrich, W. E. Milligan, G. F. Powers, Effie J. Taylor, J. W. Tilton.

## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and ten nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before June 10, 1928.

The Committee on Admissions consists of E. C. Hinsdale (Mt. Holyoke), *Acting Chairman*; W. C. Allee, Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; A. L. Keith, South Dakota; A. O. Lovejoy (Philosophy), Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder (Engineering), Ohio State; F. A. Saunders, Harvard; F. Slocum (Astronomy), Wesleyan.

Stanley C. Ball (Biology), Yale  
Preston A. Barba (German), Muhlenberg  
David M. Bavly (Mechanical Engineering), North Dakota State  
Mildred F. Berry (English), Rockford  
Helen A. Bishop (Home Economics), Iowa State  
C. B. Breed (Civil Engineering), Mass. Inst. Tech.  
Robert Brenes-Mesén (Romance Languages), Northwestern  
John D. M. Brown (English), Muhlenberg  
Elizabeth P. Brush (History), Rockford  
J. H. Buchanan (Chemistry), Iowa State  
R. E. Buchanan (Bacteriology), Iowa State  
Adolf Busse (German), Hunter  
Graves Glenwood Clark (English), William and Mary  
Anthony S. Corbiere (Romance Languages), Muhlenberg  
H. F. Cotterman (Education), Maryland  
Luther J. Deck (Mathematics), Muhlenberg  
S. H. DeVault (Agricultural Economics), Maryland  
Helen L. Drew (English), Rockford  
J. Harold DuBois (Philosophy), Hiram  
J. T. Ecker (History), William and Mary  
Fayette H. Elwell (Accounting), Wisconsin  
Wallace Emerson (Education), Occidental  
Florence Faust (Home Economics), Iowa State  
George H. Ficker (Bible and Religious Education), Lafayette  
Hazel E. Field (Zoology), Occidental

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

E. S. Furniss (Economics), Yale  
Merrill R. Good (Engineering), Iowa State  
Erwin R. Goodenough (History), Yale  
Jeanne H. Greenleaf (Romance Languages), Wisconsin  
William George Guy (Chemistry), William and Mary  
Charles S. Gwynne (Geology), Iowa State  
Ernest J. Hall (Romance Languages), Yale  
Jacob Hammer (Classics), Hunter  
Ada Hayden (Botany), Iowa State  
C. Walker Hayes (Sociology), Rockford  
M. D. Helser (Animal Husbandry), Iowa State  
Dorothea C. Hess (English), Hunter  
Dester S. Hill (Mathematics), Hunter  
Edgar L. Hinman (Philosophy), Nebraska  
David I. Hitchcock (Physiology), Yale  
L. J. Hodgins (Engineering), Maryland  
Robert C. Horn (Greek), Muhlenberg  
Elmer Hutchinson (Physics), Pittsburgh  
Karl C. Hyde (Biology), Skidmore  
Julia D. Ingersoll (French), Rockford  
C. M. Jansky (Engineering), Wisconsin  
Florence E. Janson (Government), Rockford  
Edward F. Johnson (English), Rutgers  
Marguerite E. Jones (Speech), Hunter  
John Dwight Kern (Commerce), Temple  
Fred J. King (Liturgical Music), St. Teresa  
Linus W. Kline (Psychology), Skidmore  
Francis C. Krauskopf (Chemistry), Wisconsin  
Leonard W. Labaree (History), Yale  
Ernest E. Leisy (English), Southern Methodist  
Elizabeth E. Lichty (Modern Languages), Mt. Union  
Edgar F. Long (Education), Maryland  
Jean Walker Macfarlane (Psychology), California  
Dorothy Louise Mackay (History), West Virginia  
Anne Bush MacLear (History), Hunter  
Alton L. Markley (Chemistry), Skidmore  
Ruth Marshall (Biology), Rockford  
Guerdon N. Messer (Physical Education), Williams  
George Edwin Miller (Biology), North Dakota State  
Thomas E. Moore (English), Iowa State

Thomas Neill (Physical Education), Buffalo  
P. Mabel Nelson (Home Economics), Iowa State  
S. Chesterfield Oppenheim (Law), George Washington  
O. W. Park (Zoology), Iowa State  
R. W. Pettengill (Foreign Languages), Skidmore  
John Calvin Pomeroy (Physics), Yale  
Grover Martin Pratt (Engineering), Iowa State  
Herrietta Prentiss (Speech), Hunter  
Charles J. Prohaska (Physical Education), Temple  
Joseph J. Reilly (English), Hunter  
Oliver L. Reiser (Philosophy), Pittsburgh  
Harry S. Rush (Electrical Engineering), North Dakota State  
Martha P. Sanders (Modern Languages), Rockford  
E. O. von Schwerdtner (German), Gettysburg  
Ida May Shilling (Food and Nutrition), Iowa State  
L. G. Simons (Mathematics), Hunter  
Marcus Skarstedt (Mathematics), Whittier  
F. B. Smith (Farm Crops), Iowa State  
Victor Solberg (English), Oklahoma Agricultural  
George W. Spicer (Political Science), William and Mary  
Henry E. Starr (Psychology), Pennsylvania  
Samuel N. Stearns (Psychology), Northwestern  
Mary S. Steele (English), Hudson  
Gebhard Stegemann (Chemistry), Pittsburgh  
Herluf H. Strandkov (Biology), Louisville  
Albert E. Suthers (Missions), Ohio Wesleyan  
James E. Swain (History), Muhlenberg  
James A. Taaffe (English), Fordham  
Thomas H. Taliaferro (Mathematics), Maryland  
Paul K. Taylor (Physics), Northwestern  
W. Bayard Taylor (Economics), Rockford  
Roy A. Tower (English), Indiana  
C. L. Townsend (English), Southwestern  
R. V. Truitt (Zoology), Maryland  
S. C. Vandecaveye (Agronomy), Washington State  
Russell M. Vifquain (Farm Crops), Iowa State  
Morris S. Viteles (Psychology), Pennsylvania  
E. G. Walker (Psychology), Hiram  
Lillian Watkins (Home Economics), Rockford  
Mark F. Welsh (Bacteriology), Maryland

Clarence Wentworth (English), St. Teresa

Gerald DeF. Whitney (Vocational Education), Pittsburgh

A. G. Worthing (Physics), Pittsburgh

Mary L. Yancey (Ceramic Engineering), Iowa State

Helen L. Young (History), Hunter



